



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2017

No. 107

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 22, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL L. CARTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HIGHLIGHTING THE IMPORTANCE OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which will be considered on the floor this afternoon.

I proudly championed this bill, because I truly believe that passing it

will be a win for the American worker and for American families.

Mr. Speaker, America is ready for a win.

First, I would like to thank the House Education and Workforce Committee Chairwoman VIRGINIA FOXX and Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT for their support in bringing this bill to the floor. I want to thank the Democratic lead, Representative RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY; and my colleague and CTE Caucus co-chair, JIM LANGEVIN.

I also want to thank House leadership, including Conference Chairwoman CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, Speaker PAUL RYAN, and Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE, who remains in all of our prayers for a full recovery.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation aims to restore rungs on the ladder of opportunity, because all Americans deserve a good-paying, family-sustaining job.

One of the biggest challenges facing career and technical education is the stigma, or the bias, associated with it.

Through the years, we have seen wrong-headed claims that students involved in the trades lacked ambition. These misplaced assumptions are slowly subsiding, but not soon enough. We have also seen students pushed down the college-for-all pathway that just doesn't work for some students.

CTE, or skills-based education, has established itself as a path that many high-achieving students choose in pursuit of industry certifications and hands-on skills they can use right out of high school in skills-based education programs or in college.

By modernizing the Federal investment in CTE programs, we will be able to connect more educators with industry stakeholders and close the skills gap that exists in this country. There are good jobs out there, but people need to be qualified and trained to be able to get them.

Mr. Speaker, we have all met young people who haven't been inspired in a

traditional classroom setting. We all know people who have lost jobs or are underemployed and are looking for good-paying, family-sustaining jobs. We all know people who are aspiring for a promotion, but keep falling short year after year. We all know people who are living in poverty. Maybe their families have been living in poverty for generations, for so long, they can't remember what put them there in the first place. This bill is for every one of these people.

We have heard the voices of those struggling to find the opportunities that they need to get ahead, the voices of those struggling to make ends meet. We have seen their frustration. Many are stuck in a job market that transformed quickly due to advancements in technology, and they have been left behind.

This bill will change that. It puts emphasis on advancing policies that promote good-paying jobs, and I look forward to the House passing it this afternoon. I urge my colleagues to support the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act so everyone from all walks of life can have the opportunity to succeed. It is the American way.

THE HYPE OF STATEHOOD FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, so the ruling party in Puerto Rico staged an election, and they are very proud of the results. They say 97 percent of Puerto Ricans support statehood and that the United States should grant statehood right away because of it.

Yeah, they got 97 percent of the vote. That is pretty impressive; the kind of numbers that would make Putin jealous and Saddam Hussein green with envy if he weren't dead already.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5051

The reason why the statehooders got 97 percent of the vote was pretty much the same reason those two guys get 97 percent of the vote: only one political party participated.

All the other parties thought the election was so rigged and so predetermined for the outcome the sponsors wanted that they didn't even think it was worth participating.

The vast majority of Puerto Ricans agree. Only 23 percent of the people voted. Seventy-seven percent boycotted the election because they didn't think it was worth their time; and they were absolutely right, but I guess in the era of alternative facts and made-up statistics about how many people attend your inauguration, you can try to make a one-party vote of 23 percent of the people look like a mandate for statehood. But I am here to warn my fellow Democrats not to believe the hype for one second.

Those who are peddling the fantasy of statehood sometimes call themselves Democrats, but we should be aware of an elephant in donkey's clothing.

Let's look at leaders of the statehood party here in Washington. Our colleague, the Resident Commissioner who ran on the statehood ticket, is a Republican who caucuses with the Republicans here in the House. She is a proud supporter of Donald Trump and pals around with STEVE KING and other Members who we might say aren't too friendly to Latinos and Latino causes, much less the Democratic Party line.

The Governor's Washington, D.C., office is headed by a Republican, Carlos Mercader, who was appointed to the position by Governor Rossello after serving as executive director of the right-wing political organization called Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles, infamous for its constant bashing, yes, of President Obama.

That is who is pushing statehood in D.C., which makes me wonder why any Democrat would be embracing them, especially the chairman of the DNC, unless, of course, as the media reports, it is a payback for votes for DNC chairmanship.

And as for Governor Ricardo Rossello, leader of the statehood party, the "Democrat," his conservative record speaks for itself, even though he has only been in office for less than a year.

As a candidate, he sided with the bondholders and vulture capital funds and opposed any debt restructuring for Puerto Rico, saying that Puerto Rico should pay its debt in full to Wall Street speculators, in spite of massive cuts that that would entail for police, fire, health, pensions, roads, and schools.

He hosted, yes, a Democrat, the GOP Presidential candidate, Ben Carson; and the Governor opposes LGBT rights, including same-sex marriage, and opposes the teaching of gender equality in the schools.

Townhall, the uber conservative website, sees a kindred spirit in Gov-

ernor Rossello, the Democrat, praising him for his conservative approach to helping bondholders over schoolchildren. And the Governor has withheld his criticism of President Trump, which few Democrats are able to resist, and for Latino Democrats is darn near impossible unless you are just playing the Democratic role to get ahead.

When confronted with the obvious, that Trump has denigrated Mexicans as rapists and murderers, promised to build a wall to keep Latinos out, and sneered at Puerto Rico's desire for what Donald Trump called a bailout, Rossello responded, saying of the President: "My view is I don't know that he is anti-Latino. Obviously, I have heard some derogatory remarks, but I don't know him personally, and it doesn't deter me."

So instead of spending money to help children whose schools are closing, to fix roads that are falling apart, or to pay doctors enough to prevent them from leaving Puerto Rico and going to Florida, it seems the entire Puerto Rican government is now dedicated to pursuing the unlikely chance of statehood.

It is certainly useful as a distraction from what the Governor and his D.C. operatives are actually doing.

Mr. Speaker, I have said this before: I hope to be buried one day on that beautiful island of Puerto Rico. But when I am buried, I hope it happens in a free, sovereign nation that has thrown off the yoke of colonialism and dependence on an overseas master, just as this country did, the United States of America, the country in which I was born.

I look forward to celebrating the Fourth of July. In the meantime, I think it is important to warn my fellow Democrats that they should get no more in bed with the statehooders than with any other group of rightwing conservatives with an agenda.

THE HOUSE SHOULD DEBATE THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am again on the floor to talk about a waste of life, a waste of money in Afghanistan. We have been there 16 years, and nothing has changed. Many of my colleagues agree with me that it is time to debate our country's longest war.

In response, I, along with JOHN GARAMENDI from California, have introduced H.R. 1666 in hopes of forcing that discussion. I am not asking for Members or leadership to agree with the bill itself or even vote for it, but I am asking that we be able to bring to the floor of the House the bill for the purpose of a debate.

We have not debated our role in Afghanistan since 2001. Members can either vote for or against the bill; just give the House a debate after 16 years.

Afghanistan is a failed policy. I would like to share a few sentences of an email I received this week from a great American, my friend and unofficial adviser, the 31st Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, General Chuck Krulak, regarding his thoughts on Afghanistan:

"Sixteen years we have been involved in Afghanistan . . . 16 years fighting in a country that has really never seen peace. Sixteen years with fluctuating troop strength—100,000 to 5,000—with no definition to who we are fighting—al-Qaida, Taliban or ISIS . . . you pick 'em—with no strategy, no strong reason for entering the fray, no real measure of effectiveness, no use of the five elements of national power, no support from the people themselves, a weak government, and no exit strategy, and fighting a war that is unwinnable in any real sense of the word."

Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing when the President, the Commander in Chief, abdicates the responsibility of increasing the number of troops in Afghanistan to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Mattis.

There is more reason today than ever before to have a debate on the future of Afghanistan. That is the reason why Speaker RYAN should instruct committees in the House to come forward with a new Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Where is the Congress? Don't we have a congressional responsibility to debate war if we are going to send a parent's young man or woman to die for this country?

I think we do have that responsibility.

In closing, I am going to share another quote from General Krulak, the former Commandant of the Marine Corps:

"I go back to what I have always said . . . back years ago. Afghanistan cannot be viewed through the lens of a true nation-state or as a true country. It is fragmented . . . tribal . . . controlled by war lords, economically a basket case, no real government outside of Kabul, and that is questionable, a poorly organized and led Army who will shoot at Americans as well as the 'enemy,' and no sense of what the country wants to be. No one has ever conquered Afghanistan . . . and many have tried. We will join the list of nations that have tried and failed. Afghanistan is the origin of 'whack a mole,' whether it is al-Qaida, ISIS, or the Taliban. You can't beat them in a geographic area . . . they will just pop up somewhere else."

Mr. Speaker, that is why many of us in this Congress, in both parties, feel that we have an obligation to our young men and women in uniform.

I have beside me a photo of a flag-draped coffin being taken off a plane at Dover. My question is this: How many more flag-draped coffins are we going to see when we increase the number of troops in Afghanistan without one word from Congress—not one word?

Mr. Speaker, we do owe it to the American people who pay their taxes, we do owe it to the parents whose young men and women will go and die for America. We do owe it to have a debate on the floor of the House. It has been 16 years since we have had a debate.

God help America and, please, God bless America.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, like in anyone's office, the photos and trinkets on display in mine tell a little bit about who I am: a wedding photo, a picture of me and my family on our swearing-in day, a copy of the first bill I had signed into law, the moments that I am proud of, the pieces of me that I want to share with the world.

In this body, the people's House is no different. We have always been proud of our democracy and even prouder to display it for all the world to see. That is why we keep these cameras on whenever we are in session. It is why every single word that is uttered on this floor is documented and preserved long after the day we draw our last breath. It is why we walk beside Americans of all backgrounds and beliefs through the rotunda with the same awe of our Nation's history embodied in bronze statues and bold paintings. It is why every single night this building glows through the darkness; because the light of democracy not only lays bare our divisions and dissent, but it lights a path to our proudest moments.

In times of war and peace, fights over civil rights and equality, our debates in these halls have always been driven by a fierce conviction of our beliefs and a shared vision of a kinder, stronger country. Disagreements, yes, but enlightened by ideals, by vision, by a shared commitment to our American experiment.

And when you stand behind those principles and your policies, you welcome that spotlight; you engage in that debate; you are eager to answer questions; you are ready to be held accountable.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we should all be concerned by what has transpired in our Capitol over the course of the past few weeks. For if you are proud of your legislation, you don't lock it behind closed doors; you don't shield it from the very people that are going to be hurt most by it; you don't turn off the cameras and then call it mean; you don't sabotage a healthcare system and leave a wake of devastation and destruction to score political points.

Drafting TrumpCare under the cover of darkness is an admission that this bill cannot—cannot—withstand the sunlight of our neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the America that I know would never turn its back on a

friend or a stranger in need. TrumpCare does.

The America that I know doesn't tell the sick, the elderly, or the frail that you are on your own. TrumpCare does.

The America that I know doesn't tell the young woman struggling through an opioid recovery that your next relapse, well, that one was one too many. TrumpCare does.

The America that I know understands that our greatness comes from our goodness; that we lean into challenges, you don't yield to them; that the frustration that we see in our streets and our communities is a cry for our government to be as good and as decent as the people we aim to serve. They, we, deserve nothing less. TrumpCare is not that cure.

IN MEMORY OF A.A. "GUS" KARLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the remarkable life of Mr. "Gus" Karle of Waycross, Georgia, who passed away on Sunday, May 7, 2017.

From a young age, Mr. Karle was deeply interested in trains and railways. In 1939, he skipped school to visit his local train station, where he landed his first job at the young age of 12, working as an assistant porter, responsible for loading and unloading train passengers.

After graduating from Wabash College in Indiana, he went on to start a career in railroad industry design and construction, working as an administrator for nearly 40 years.

Mr. Karle's career was extremely important to the economic development of the City of Waycross, Georgia, by way of his involvement in the design of Rice Yard, one of the busiest CSX rail crossroads in the Nation. Rice Yard serves as a daily transfer point for nearly 3,000 rail cars and remains one of the city's biggest employers, staffed by nearly 1,300 people from Ware and surrounding counties.

Mr. Karle retired from CSX Railroad in 2016. Last year, former CSX president, Clarence Gooden, whom Mr. Karle hired and trained in 1970, proclaimed every November 16 "A.A. 'Gus' Karle Day" in commemoration of Mr. Karle's hard work with the company.

Mr. Karle is a legend around Waycross. I want to thank him and his family for everything that he did to make Waycross and the First Congressional District of Georgia what it is today.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF MRS. NAN THOMPSON MILLER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mrs. Nan Thompson Miller, who passed away on Saturday, June 10, at the age of 89, and was laid to rest last week in Dublin, Georgia.

Mrs. Miller worked hard during her long life, selflessly serving others through a profession she loved.

At the age of 17, Mrs. Miller joined the United States Army Nurse Corps and attended the University of Georgia to study nursing, where she was a member of the last graduating class to receive their RN degrees.

Following the war, Mrs. Miller put her training to work with the Naval Hospital in Dublin, where she eventually rose to the position of head nurse before retiring in 1983.

As a young nurse, Mrs. Miller met the late George Anderson Miller, to whom she was married for 55 years. The Millers were active members of their community that helped form the Pine Forest United Methodist Church. Mrs. Miller was also a member of the Pilot Club of Dublin, the Order of the Blarney Stone, and the American Nurses Association.

Today, I have the pleasure of working with Mrs. Miller's granddaughter, Brooke. I can say from my own experience that Brooke's commitment to public service and dedication to our constituents is a wonderful testament to the legacy of her grandmother.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members will join me; my wife, Amy; and my staff in sending our thoughts and prayers to the Miller family as they remember the life and legacy of Mrs. Nan Thompson Miller.

GEORGIA PRESS ASSOCIATION AWARD RECIPIENT, KATHLEEN RUSSELL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Kathleen Russell, from Darien, Georgia, who received the President's Award on behalf of the Georgia Press Association on Friday, June 2, 2017.

Ms. Russell's strong dedication to her role as longtime editor of The Darien News makes her worthy of such an honor. Each year, an individual who has exhibited outstanding leadership abilities and who serves as an innovator in Georgia's media industry is named a recipient of this prestigious award.

For generations, members of Ms. Russell's family have worked in the press, and it is only fitting that Ms. Russell would find herself working as a journalist.

Constituents remember Ms. Russell's beloved father, Mr. Charles Williamson, as a journalist who stood up to wrongdoers in McIntosh County, exposing corruption and theft by a multitude of former county officials.

As a child, Kathleen assisted her parents in the production of the weekly newspaper. During that time, her parents nurtured her love for the press.

After graduating from the University of Georgia in 1974, Ms. Russell began a career as an educator. She left education in pursuit of a career as a journalist and assumed the role of associate editor of The Darien News. In 2009, Ms. Russell was honored for her hard work when she was named publisher and editor of the newspaper.

Ms. Russell has remained an active member of McIntosh County, serving on several boards over the years, including the Division of Family and

Children Services, Darien Downtown Development Authority, and the College of Coastal Georgia Foundation.

Ms. Russell, I applaud your efforts to keep the citizens of Georgia's First Congressional District in tune with current events throughout our State and country.

TRIBUTE TO COOK COUNTY COMMISSIONER ROBERT STEELE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, I was saddened to know of the passing of Cook County Commissioner and President Pro Tem Robert Steele, whom I have known since his childhood days. As a matter of fact, I lived in the same neighborhood with the Steele family from the year that Commissioner Robert Steele was born.

I count myself as a Steele family friend and have worked with Bob's mother, Bobbie, since the late 1960s. His father, Robert, was a mentor to my son Stacey.

I had the pleasure of watching Commissioner Steele grow from a child into becoming an adult and an outstanding local and national leader.

Commissioner Steele was so much more than a man with a title. He was part of the glue which held his community together. He was a big brother to neighborhood boys whom he often took with him to events and activities. He was a mentor and an inspiration to those who came into contact with him. He was a great advocate for organ donation and transplantation. You see, he was a recipient from his sister, who gave him a kidney.

He was an Omega man, a great frat brother, and he was a leader of the West Side and countywide Black elected officials. He meant the world to his family and brought great pride and joy to his parents, Robert and former Cook County Board President Bobbie Steele.

Robert Steele was an absolute leader who provided leadership and guidance on a regular basis wherever he went. He was active in his church, in his community, in his neighborhood. He was intelligent, astute, and not afraid.

Of all the people that I have known who come from the West Side of Chicago as elected officials, none has brought more to the table than Bob, except, perhaps, his mother, Bobbie.

Our community will long remember the work of Cook County Commissioner Bobbie Steele. Perhaps the songwriter was correct when he said that "the good die young." Bob was indeed young, but he was a leader among leaders and a man among men.

I salute you, Commissioner Robert Steele, and long may your life, your work, and your legacy continue.

REMEMBERING FLOOD OF JUNE 23, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, on June 23, 2016, we experienced one of the darkest days in West Virginia's history.

Floodwaters raced through small towns without warning, washing away homes, washing away businesses, and, yes, washing away lives. Twenty-three souls were lost, while thousands were left without shelter and food.

Now as we approach the 1-year anniversary of this tragic event, we pause to remember those we lost and honor their lives. We reflect on how our communities changed over this past year. We pledge to continue rebuilding until our towns and our cities are better than they were before the rivers rose.

We have seen so many examples of strength, faith, and hope in this past year, examples that carry us forward and inspire us all. More work remains to be done. We still have churches, schools, libraries, and other community centers that need to be rebuilt, replaced, and restocked. Many are still in temporary and rental housing. The scars still remain.

But the message that we should carry forward is the one that carried us through this terrible event: the knowledge that West Virginians will always have each other's backs. We are stronger when we stand united than when we stand alone.

Through everything that lies ahead, we will stay strong. We will thank those who put their lives on the line to help rescue others. We will remember and honor those whom we lost, and we will continue to offer our support to those who are rebuilding their lives. That is what we do as neighbors. That is what we do as friends. That is what we do as West Virginians.

□ 1030

NEW HEALTHCARE BILL IS ONLY GOOD FOR THE WEALTHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, we watched President Donald Trump and Speaker PAUL RYAN ram their healthcare bill through the House of Representatives before it even had a cost analysis.

It didn't take long for us to learn why. It will strip over 20 million Americans of affordable healthcare. It will drive up premiums and out-of-pocket expenses for older Americans by as much as 25 percent. It will allow insurance companies to discriminate against pregnant women, children, and seniors. And this is all so Donald Trump can give a tax break to his wealthiest friends.

Mr. Speaker, this healthcare bill will literally be a death sentence to some

Americans. House Republicans had years—let me say that again—had years to come up with ways to make healthcare more affordable. But instead, they would rather pull the plug out from millions of families who put their healthcare in the hands of the insurance companies.

Since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, nearly 40,000 of my constituents have enrolled in Covered California, and nearly 200,000 in San Bernardino County, our residents, have been added to Medi-Cal following the ACA expansion. TrumpCare will end Medicaid and leave millions of Americans without coverage.

Children will be stripped of their coverage because their parents will fall into an income bracket that doesn't satisfy our President. This legislation isn't just bad, it is detestable. According to Donald Trump, it is even mean. Though, apparently, it doesn't matter how mean it is for middle class families as long as it gives tax breaks to his wealthy friends.

And now, Senate Republicans have taken a page out of the House Republican playbook and are writing their healthcare bill in secret. This is not how we govern. This is not what the American people expect.

SUPPORT CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my full support for H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

For more than 30 years, Federal funding, known as Perkins funding, has helped support career and technical education programs at the State and local level. This legislation reauthorizes that funding and makes needed improvements to ensure Perkins dollars are spent efficiently and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I am a big believer in career tech programs for three simple reasons: They help prepare students for rewarding careers; they ensure American workers have the tools necessary for skilled trades that are foundational to our society; and they boost our economy by providing a quality workforce.

When it comes to higher education, we all know that there has been a silent stigma attached to not completing an academic degree at a 4-year university. For years, we were afraid to say that college isn't for everybody, when the truth is, career tech programs can actually lead many Americans to better quality of life.

Thankfully, I believe those days are over. Efforts like Mike Rowe's "Go Build Alabama" campaign has been tremendously successful in raising awareness and dispelling myths about the jobs that exist in skilled trades. This rising generation is showing signs of being more entrepreneurial, with a

willingness to work outside the box. Our programs have greatly improved over the years to offer training for careers our students are actually interested in.

Mr. Speaker, my State of Alabama is blessed with a strong network of community colleges offering a wide array of career training. Alabama Community College System has more than 79,000 students enrolled in CTE programs, and over 70 public high schools in Alabama are now offering CTE courses. They are working hand in glove with industry to make sure that the training matches the jobs that will be waiting for students when they complete their courses.

I visited one such program recently in Tallassee, a small town in central Alabama. Tallassee High School administrators have worked tirelessly to build a program that serves the growing needs of local students. The city and county are working together to improve facilities and make sure students have access to transportation.

Up until now, students in Tallassee have had to take a bus 30 minutes away to Wetumpka, or even an hour away to Montgomery to Trenholm State, to access these career tech courses. Now, thanks to the hard work of Tallassee's leaders and educators, students are beginning to access these programs right in their own hometown.

I visited another thriving career-type program a few months ago in Geneva, a small town in Alabama's Wiregrass region. Geneva High School has partnered with the Alabama National Guard, whose local armory serves as a training site for high-demand skills, such as automotive technology, welding, aviation maintenance, and health science. Students from city and county schools can get ahead on their college coursework via dual enrollment with Lurleen B. Wallace Community College or Enterprise State.

Geneva and Tallassee are not alone in their commitment to our students. Dothan's Wallace Community College offers training in 16 high-demand career fields. Wallace takes their programs to the next level by combining traditional study with hands-on experience. Their criminal justice program, for example, utilizes a virtual law enforcement training simulator, the only of its kind on an Alabama college campus.

These programs serve as a model, not only for the State of Alabama but for the Nation as a whole. Their successes demonstrate the potential career-type programs hold.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is so much more than just funding. It makes important improvements to our career tech policy, including: simplifying the application process that community and State leaders have to navigate in order to receive Federal funds; providing more flexibility to administrators so they can adjust to the needs of the students and the industry; improving accountability and transparency to

ensure that the programs that we are funding actually deliver results; and, lastly, ensuring a limited Federal role in education, just as we did in the new K-12 law.

Mr. Speaker, with the modern workplace changing at a rapid pace, it is imperative that educators and facilities keep up. With this bill, these programs can continue to successfully connect today's students with the careers of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to take the next step in career and technical education today. The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act will help equip our students with skills, knowledge, and experience they need to start their careers.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this legislation and support our future workforce.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PHILANDO CASTILE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a public servant taken from us too soon; an individual who, through his life and example, inspired others, especially children, to be respectful and kind; a man who lived his life in service to others, Philando Castile.

In recent days, his name has been back in the headlines, but I want to talk about the person behind the stories. I want to talk about a man failed by our creed of liberty and justice for all. Philando Castile was the beloved nutrition services supervisor at J.J. Hill Montessori Magnet School, who was so invested in the young people he served, that he memorized the names and food allergies of more than 500 students.

One of his coworkers said: Kids loved him. He was quiet, respectful, and kind. I knew him as warm and funny.

Another said: He was as much a teacher as any teacher in that building.

His life was an example of living honorably for your community, for your family, and for the more than 500 students who loved him. Even in his final moments, he showed respect and dignity in what must have been a terrifying experience.

Mr. Castile's loss is our loss. He lived life as we all should: loving and respecting those around him. When he was told by an officer to get his ID, he complied and respectfully informed the officer that he was lawfully carrying a concealed firearm; that he had a valid permit. When he went to get his ID, as ordered, he was shot—not once, but seven times—not because of non-compliance, not because he was violent, not because he was a menacing threat. What killed him was his Blackness, or, more precisely, fear of his Blackness killed him.

Tragically, his story is not unique. This happens every day to Black men and women in America. Philando's story only made headlines because it was live-streamed on Facebook and showed a 4-year-old girl sitting behind him as seven rounds were emptied into his chest. A 4-year-old girl, that even Philando's murderer said "was in my line of fire."

Mr. Speaker, this murder was so downright outrageous that it led *The Federalist*, a publication that previously published an article on how Black Lives Matter protests were destroying America, to call the not-guilty verdict an abomination.

Indeed, this is an abomination and a complete miscarriage of justice. *The Federalist* and I see eye to eye on this one thing. Groups in the center, on the right, on the left, have publicly and vocally condemned his murder, except for one: the National Rifle Association. The NRA's silence is sickening, deafening, and very hypocritical in this tragic American hour. For decades, the NRA has used fearmongering to claim that they are the sole organization fighting to protect the rights of every American to carry a firearm.

Where were they for Philando? Where is their outrage? Where is their stand for Philando's freedoms and rights? Where is their demand for better police training when dealing with citizens authorized to carry a firearm?

Shame, they have no outrage at this verdict. Shame for their double standard in supporting people with valid concealed-carry permits. They offer nothing but a tepid Facebook statement expressing concern.

Concern? The NRA has concern for Philando? Shame on the NRA. For them, it clearly isn't about rights for all. For NRA members who don't fit the right profile, they should give serious thought to even being members of the NRA.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Kevin Kitrell Ross, Unity of Sacramento, Sacramento, California, offered the following prayer:

May we turn within and look higher to the God of our understanding and pray.

Loving Presence, we invoke from the celestial balconies the witness of the

pioneers of our progress whose bloodied journeys marshaled unprecedented faith and birthed a new nation of radical inclusion.

Bless these sons and daughters of promise gathered in this, the people's House. Let them reach higher for crowns of conscience to exemplify compassion and bring from their districts to their desks sharp pencils that carve on their hearts the faces of freedom that they represent.

Let this House be an incubator for our best ideals, not a prison for our poorest politics.

Let these heroes and sheroes of the people's House summon the intellectual imagination and intuitive navigation to serve bolder together and break through the ideological gridlock that arrests the potential of our great Republic.

Let these innovators of cooperation and builders of the beloved community reunite these States of America and lead the way for a world that works for all.

This is enough. In the name of a love supreme we pray, and so it is.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TROTT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND KEVIN KITRELL ROSS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the House to our guest chaplain, Reverend Kevin Kitrell Ross, Senior Minister of Unity of Sacramento.

Kevin is regarded as a respected interfaith social justice leader, committed to building bridges of understanding and cooperation across race, culture, class, and religious lines.

Whether in his role leading one of the Nation's most diverse and integrated congregations, conducting diversity and implicit bias trainings, or being an outspoken activist for healing the crisis between law enforcement and communities of color, Kevin is dedicated to strengthening communities through

dialogue, direct encounter, and education.

A South Side of Chicago native, Kevin is a Morehouse College graduate, a senior fellow of the American Leadership Forum, a member of the Interfaith Council of Sacramento, and a three-time delegate to the Parliament of the World's Religions.

Kevin and his wife, Anita, have three children and reside in Elk Grove, California. Anita is the founder of Women for Equality. They are both committed to building a world that works for all.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Reverend Kevin Ross and thank him for offering today's opening prayer in the U.S. House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING THE NORA SANDIGO CHILDREN FOUNDATION

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Nora Sandigo Children Foundation, a non-profit organization in my home city of Miami, working around the clock to serve kids in our community who have been separated from their parents by deportation.

I have known Nora, the founder of this organization, for many years, and I have seen firsthand her true passion for ensuring the well-being of these children. Through the support of donors and volunteers, this organization is able to provide assistance in the form of food, clothing, educational programs, legal advice, and many other vital services.

This week, Nora will be visiting our Nation's Capital, with a delegation of 50 children from Florida, to advocate for the restructuring of our immigration policies so that the kids for whom she cares, who are as American as you and I, don't have to grow up apart from their parents.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation must do right for these children, and I urge my colleagues in Congress and the administration to work together so that we can have an immigration system that reflects our Nation's compassion and provides a solution that is fair and just to everyone.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRESS MUST RESTORE THE FULL PROTECTIONS OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT NOW

(Mr. BROWN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last year's Presidential election was the first in 50 years without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act. What was the result?

Fourteen States had new voting restrictions, including strict voter ID, cuts to same-day registration and early voting, and fewer polling places. This suppressed the vote, particularly among voters of color and in poor communities, and had a major impact in close races in North Carolina, Virginia, and Florida, according to the Brennan Center for Justice.

The Voting Rights Act once enjoyed bipartisan support, and Congress should, once again, come together to modernize the law and respond to the Supreme Court's objections. Yet despite calls to pass legislation for the past 4 years, nothing has happened.

Voting is a right, not a privilege, and there is no debating that point.

The Founders in Philadelphia, women at Seneca Falls, and marchers in Selma all recognized the power of the vote. When we protect the rights of voters to make their choices, whatever they may be, we do our part to build a more perfect union.

We can't wait for the next election. Congress must restore the full protections of the Voting Rights Act now.

TIME TO BAN TOURIST TRAVEL TO NORTH KOREA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Otto Warmbier was a shining example of what American families hope for sons and daughters: intellectually curious, interested in the world, and bright. Sadly, Otto was murdered by the North Korean dictatorship. By imprisoning him under sham charges, the Communist totalitarian North Korean regime is clearly responsible for his death.

Otto's story highlights the brutality of the North Korean murderers, one that wrongfully imprisons American citizens and uses them as bargaining chips in an effort to gain attention on the world stage. It is past time we strongly restrict tourist travel to this Potemkin atrocity.

I am grateful to have introduced bipartisan legislation, with Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, that would enable the Treasury Department to regulate travel to North Korea through licenses, and no licenses would be able to be granted for tourist travel. Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ED ROYCE has been instrumental for legislative success.

We will be most successful defeating brutality by denying the dictatorship any source of income and depriving it of the opportunity to use innocent Americans like UVA student Otto Warmbier as hostages.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

WISHING LIEUTENANT JEFF NEVILLE A SPEEDY RECOVERY

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in my hometown of Flint, Michigan, there was a violent attack on a police officer at Flint Bishop International Airport. And like many in my community, I am shocked and horrified by this cowardly attack.

My thoughts are with injured officer, Lieutenant Jeff Neville, and his family; and I am relieved that he is in stable condition. He is expected to recover. I have known Jeff for decades, dating back to our service together in county government. He is a true public servant, and he is deeply committed to the community that he serves.

His actions to subdue the attacker, even while he was under attack, are truly heroic. He helped save others from potential harm.

I also want to thank those individuals who put themselves in harm's way to help Lieutenant Neville, including the Bishop chief of police, Chris Miller, and an airport maintenance worker who stepped in, Richard Cruell. Their actions saved lives.

I am thankful that the FBI, the Michigan State Police, the Flint Police, and other agencies are investigating this terrible attack as a potential incident of terror.

I just hope all my colleagues will join me in extending their prayers to Lieutenant Neville and his family in hopes for his speedy recovery.

IN MEMORY OF PATRICIA LUCILLE MCKENZIE

(Mr. TROTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Patricia Lucille McKenzie, of Garden City, Michigan. Patricia passed away on May 31, 2017, and is dearly missed by her many family and friends, including her husband of 55 years, Doug McKenzie, and her children, Pamela, Barbara, Phil, and Marcia, as well as her 12 grandchildren.

In her 78 years, Patricia was devoted to her loving family, her faith, and to her strong belief in the principles of American democracy. She is also remembered for her love of her dog, Patty Lou, and, of course, for her passion for the Montreal Canadiens.

Patricia's story is the story of countless Americans: a hardworking person, a patriotic citizen, a loving wife, and a devoted mother.

To Patricia's many family and friends, I hope that during this difficult time you will find comfort in the knowledge that she has been called

home in peace and harmony. Remember that Scripture tells us "the peace of God, which transcends all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds."

Mr. Speaker, our friend, Patricia Lucille McKenzie, will be dearly missed, but we go on to remember and honor her legacy, just as she would want us to do.

REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE BILL IS A REPULSIVE SCAM

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill that was unveiled this morning, much like the House Republican healthcare bill, is a repulsive scam perpetrated against the American people.

On page 30 of the bill, section 120, under Executive Compensation Tax Cut, UnitedHealthcare will get a tax cut, under this bill, representing \$15.5 million. If that is not egregious enough, the fact is that UnitedHealthcare is under investigation today by the United States Department of Justice for defrauding the Medicare program of billions of dollars over the last 7 years.

This should be rejected today and, decisively, by all decent Members of this Congress who believe there is a moral responsibility to ensure that the legislation passed here is fair and just.

CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATION OF ROSE HISTORICAL CEMETERY IN TARPON SPRINGS, FLORIDA

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, I had the honor of attending the centennial commemoration of Rose Historical Cemetery in Tarpon Springs, Florida.

Rose is the oldest African-American cemetery in Pinellas County and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. It was an especially meaningful ceremony because it was held on Juneteenth, the anniversary marking the end of slavery in the U.S.

Those who have been laid to rest at Rose represent a major part of Tarpon Springs history and culture. Civil rights pioneers, veterans, and many others, including friends I grew up with in Tarpon, are buried there.

I would like to especially thank Tarpon Springs Mayor Chris Alahouzos, Annie Dabbs, a member of the cemetery's board, and the dozens of volunteers who work tirelessly year-round to preserve the legacy of Rose Cemetery. Because of their dedication, Rose continues to be a beautiful, historical site for our community.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATING BABCOCK & WILCOX ON THEIR 150TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of one of Charlotte's most exemplary businesses, Babcock & Wilcox, which today celebrates their 150th anniversary.

Boilers made by Babcock & Wilcox powered Thomas Edison's laboratories and New York's first subway.

During World War II, much of the U.S. Navy fleet was powered by Babcock & Wilcox boilers, and the company supplied components for the vital Manhattan Project. Later Babcock & Wilcox fabricated components for the USS *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear-powered submarine.

More recently, Babcock & Wilcox has become a leading innovator in emissions control technologies, helping to protect our air, water, and land by controlling emissions from hundreds of power plants and industrial facilities around the world.

In 2010, Babcock & Wilcox moved to Charlotte and became a vital part of the Charlotte region's growing cluster of industry-leading energy firms.

Congratulations today to Babcock & Wilcox's 5,000 employees on this 150th anniversary.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE ADVOCATE JEANNIE CASTELLS

(Mr. LANCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the tireless dedication of one of New Jersey's greatest Alzheimer's awareness advocates, Jeannie Castells of Lambertville, Hunterdon County.

Jeannie has served as a congressional ambassador for the Alzheimer's Association since 2014, meeting with Members of Congress here on Capitol Hill, holding educational events in which I have participated in Congressional District Seven, and organizing fundraisers like the Walk to End Alzheimer's.

Unfortunately, Jeannie's advocacy does not come without tragedy because the disease has claimed the lives of both her mother and her husband.

And Jeannie's family is not alone, Mr. Speaker. Alzheimer's is the Nation's sixth leading cause of death. More than 5 million Americans are currently living with Alzheimer's, and as many as 16 million Americans are estimated to have Alzheimer's by 2050.

That is why in June, Alzheimer's Awareness Month, I urge advocates around the country, like Jeannie, to continue to fight for Alzheimer's research funding. We are on the verge of a breakthrough, and with your help, we will certainly find one.

ROBERT MUELLER AS SPECIAL COUNSEL IS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for 7½ years before coming to Congress, I was a judge in Tennessee trying felony criminal cases. I tried the attempted murder of James Earl Ray and many other high-profile cases.

Robert Mueller, with his close relationship with James Comey, should never have been appointed as special prosecutor in a case in which Mr. Comey is such a central player. Mr. Mueller should never have accepted such an appointment when offered. That would have been the honorable thing to do.

Then, to make matters much worse, he has hired several lawyers who are big contributors to and are active campaigners for Hillary Clinton and other Democrats.

Most people believe there are many conflicts of interest here. There are hundreds of thousands of lawyers who could have been hired who had not been involved in any way for either the President or Mrs. Clinton.

This investigation has been tainted, and any action now will look like a partisan witch hunt. Former Speaker Gingrich said what we now need is a special counsel to investigate the special counsel.

SUPPORT CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, legislation set to pass today to reauthorize and improve upon the Carl Perkins—a Member of this House in the past—Career and Technical Education program.

As a former teacher, it is my firm belief that school is not just and cannot be one size fits all. The Carl Perkins funding has allowed school districts and school boards from across the country to develop innovative programs to educate our Nation's youth.

I have always supported alternative forms of education. Education not only trains the mind, but trains our Nation's youth with valuable skills to succeed outside the classroom and in the workforce.

Many students in my State and across the Nation rely on nontraditional opportunities to achieve success, and Carl Perkins grants have done the job of providing additional opportunities for our youth.

In my State, these programs have led the way to providing our workforce

with valuable certificates and credentials in Alaska's many industries. They include: qualification for Alaska's maritime and transportation industry; certifications in welding and carpentry; pre-apprenticeships for electricians, heavy equipment operators, and ironworkers; medical certifications, such as EMTs and certified nursing aides; certification of OSHA and HAZMAT agencies; and culinary arts and building maintenance repair.

These are all programs, Mr. Speaker, that help the working person and the young person to become prepared—just not going to college. They can become someone that can contribute to the good of our State and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this legislation. I proudly stand here to support H.R. 2353.

HONORING THE LIVES OF CURTIS BILLUE AND CHRISTOPHER MONICA

(Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of two Georgia State corrections officers, Sergeants Curtis Billue and Christopher Monica, who were killed in the line of duty on June 13 in Putnam County, Georgia.

I share with their families the deep sorrow perpetrated by the violence of two rogue inmates, and I pray that God comforts the Billue and Monica families in their time of grief.

Described as hardworking, kind, and devoted, Sergeants Billue and Monica will be remembered for their service and sacrifice, for their loyalty as public servants, and for their love and dedication to their families.

I am grateful that the two perpetrators of this crime have been brought back into custody, and I am confident that justice will be served.

American law enforcement officers make a promise to keep our country and communities safe. In return, we must restore the tradition of respect and honor that is owed to all members of the law enforcement community who are on the front lines.

In gratitude to Sergeants Billue and Monica, Governor Nathan Deal ordered the flags of Georgia to fly at halfstaff on July 17 and 20.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing their lives and service and to say "thank you" to every brother and sister in uniform who stand on that thin blue line.

COMMENDING ARMY SPECIALIST MICHAEL MARTENEY FOR HIS HEROISM

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special recognition to Army Specialist Michael Marteney for an incred-

ible act of heroism. While off duty, Specialist Marteney displayed remarkable selflessness and courage in the rescue and treatment of a fatally wounded civilian.

On May 27, 2017, a motor home traveling in Oak Grove, Kentucky, collided with a civilian building. With complete disregard for his own personal safety, Michael pulled his car over to the site of the accident and rushed to the scene. The front of the motor home was crushed, and Michael saw that the driver had life-threatening injuries to his head and leg.

With gasoline still rapidly spilling from the vehicle, Michael was able to gain access to the passenger side of the motor home and fashion a makeshift tourniquet. Oak Grove Police Officer Sergeant Havens arrived on scene and handed Michael a combat application tourniquet, which he swiftly applied.

Despite the imminence of fire or explosion, Michael went into the back of the motor home to locate a first-aid kit. Michael conveyed lifesaving information to EMS about the driver's disposition that prompted the call for immediate flight evacuation services.

If Specialist Michael Marteney had not taken control of the situation and implemented key medical assistance, the wounded driver would not have survived the trauma sustained.

I am honored to recognize Specialist Marteney's lifesaving actions, an inspiring illustration of the good will of others and the consequences of brave deeds. I thank Specialist Marteney for his bravery and all others in Oak Grove who were involved in the rescue.

RECOGNIZING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY'S PIONEER CLASS

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 50th anniversary of Grand Valley State University's pioneer class.

In June of 1967, in a tent on its Allendale, Michigan campus, Grand Valley held its long dreamed of first commencement ceremony. On that day, 138 seniors, including 86 members of the pioneer class that started in 1963, received their diplomas from Michigan's newest college.

These first graduates laid the foundation of a university that would grow to offer 124 degrees, enroll students from 82 different countries, and boast a 94 percent employment rate for its graduates—always a good thing.

After that first graduation ceremony in 1967, GVSU had 138 alumni. Today, the university has over 110,000 proud alumni throughout Michigan and, frankly, around the globe.

Under the leadership of its first president, James Zumberge, followed by the continued guidance of Arend Lubbers, Mark Murray, and current president, Thomas Haas, Grand Valley has come

to be a renowned institution and one of the 100 largest universities in this Nation.

During the very first commencement address, a speaker noted: "No one could ever possibly chart your course through these years." And it is hard to imagine that the pioneer class could have dreamed of the role that they would be playing in helping Grand Valley State University achieve such great heights.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Grand Valley State University's pioneer class of 1967, the original "Lakers for a Lifetime."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2842, ACCELERATING INDIVIDUALS INTO THE WORKFORCE ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 396 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 396

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2842) to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-22. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the

amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of June 22, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 2353) to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of a very important measure. The resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 2842, Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

□ 1230

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2842 is a commonsense proposal to help transition welfare recipients into steady, paying jobs. Moving welfare recipients into work is a central goal of TANF, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. This bipartisan bill would incentivize employers to hire TANF recipients and help subsidize these new employees' salaries for up to a year to allow them to transition into the workforce.

The policy idea behind H.R. 2842 is simple: under this bill, States can establish partnerships with employers to hire recipients of TANF dollars. Through these partnerships, employers would receive a subsidy of up to 50 percent of the wage for a TANF recipient while the other 50 percent would be paid by the employer.

Beneficiaries would have to meet three requirements: they must be a TANF recipient, they must be unemployed, and they must have an income of 20 percent or less of the Federal poverty level. H.R. 2842 will direct our resources to the neediest individuals and families to help them accelerate these welfare recipients back into the workforce.

Mr. Speaker, President Ronald Reagan once noted: "We should meas-

ure welfare's success by how many people leave welfare, not by how many people are added."

The legislation under consideration in today's rule is a fulfillment of that promise. Under H.R. 2842, State and local governments will be able to better utilize their TANF dollars to help move individuals into paying work and eventually help them transition out of the welfare system altogether.

Helping people get back to work is a great deal for the individuals who will be helped under this program, for the employers, for the economy, and for the American people. This bill is, at its core, about helping unemployed Americans get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation filled with hardworking people, and I have seen over and over again how badly many of the unemployed want to return to work. Many, if not most, recipients of TANF are in the program not because they want to be, but because they have been forced to be by circumstance. These unemployed Americans want nothing more than to return to the dignity of the workforce as quickly as they are able to do so. This bill will help remove barriers to employment and will incentivize employers to hire current TANF recipients.

Workers re-entering the workforce is a good thing for society. Not only will workers who receive jobs under this program be taken off of welfare rolls, thus ensuring the continued success of that program, but these new workers will be better able to contribute to better lives for themselves, for their families, and for their communities.

Here in Washington, we too often describe policy solutions as being "commonsense" or "win-win," but in this case it is absolutely true. H.R. 2842 is a commonsense solution and is a win-win for everyone involved: the workers, the employers, the community, and the country.

That is why this legislation will receive a substantial bipartisan vote tomorrow. Whatever their differences, Republicans and Democrats alike want to put unemployed people back to work. This bill will actually succeed in doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Oklahoma for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

This measure is a bipartisan bill that will help Americans receiving support from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families find good-paying jobs.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are more than 6 million job openings in our country. That is the highest level recorded since we started tracking this data, yet the share of Americans participating in the workforce is at a four-decade low. Clearly, there are underlying issues

that need to be addressed to get more people plugged into the workforce.

For people looking for jobs, TANF serves as a lifeline. TANF is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services and is designed to help in-need families achieve self-sufficiency. Under the program, States receive block grants to design and operate their own programs to fulfill the goals of the TANF program.

It is important to note that States are at risk of financial penalty if TANF participants receive more than a year of education or if States have more than 30 percent of the State TANF caseload in education and training programs. Due to these limits, States have largely abandoned efforts to promote or support work in their TANF programs. This is important to understand because one of the most effective ways to get more people employed is through employer-driven on-the-job training.

Research has shown that, properly structured, these programs result in better and more stable employment, especially for individuals who are otherwise unlikely to find work.

Although the measure we are debating today does not address this issue, this bill will help tip the scale back toward job-training programs. H.R. 2842 establishes demonstration projects that combine work, training, and support for hard-to-employ TANF recipients.

This bill provides a onetime appropriation of \$100 million to subsidize these programs. After the 12-month period, States are going to be required to report to Congress on the effectiveness of subsidizing wages in moving individuals receiving TANF into full-time jobs.

Since we are talking about jobs, we need to recognize that we as an institution have not provided the necessary resources to get people back to work. If you were to ask any Member of this body to outline his or her top priorities, I guarantee you that job creation would be mentioned every single time. We all agree on the need, but from there, the conversation stops. There are lots of proposals in Congress to create jobs, but we have been unable to pass a large-scale, bipartisan bill for quite some time. This really needs to change.

Given the legislation we are debating today, it is interesting to me that President Donald John Trump's budget proposal cut workforce training programs by 39 percent. Rather than present a jobs bill, he has presented a plan that would actually stop helping people looking for jobs. That, in my judgment, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. In bringing forward this legislation, I think it is being made clear that this body does not share that approach, but we need to do more than a single, targeted bill.

Five months into the Trump administration, Republican leadership still has not put forward a single large-scale piece of legislation to create good-pay-

ing jobs or raise the wages of hard-working Americans, but its leadership has rejected Democratic proposals out of hand.

We should be working every day on creating jobs and raising wages for everyone everywhere in America. But instead of focusing on job creation, Donald John Trump's budget request would destroy approximately 1.4 million jobs.

His budget would eviscerate billions of dollars from critical job-creating investments in infrastructure and innovation, dismantle skills training programs like the one we are discussing here today, ransack education benefits, and leave our country in a weakened state. Instead of bringing jobs back to communities that have fallen on hard times, the budget walks away from them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it at this. The underlying measure we are debating today is a good step forward. But one step is not nearly enough. We need to do more, not less, to strengthen our communities and help working families.

Just as I urge Donald John Trump to move past the campaign rhetoric and get serious, I also urge this body to lead with more bipartisan measures that will provide for necessary resources for those who need them most.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by agreeing with my good friend on many of the points that he made. I was particularly struck by the point he made about the low participation rate in the labor force. That has been a problem that has been with us, quite frankly, for, as he pointed out, several decades, and it is one that has gotten worse.

That is attributable in large part to another point that my friend made, effectively the thing around here we call the skills gap. We have literally millions of jobs available in this country, and employers are ready to hire people but they simply don't have the training.

I couldn't agree more with my good friend that on-the-job training is sometimes the best training. You actually acquire the skill that you need to be successful, and the situation of this legislation will actually, again, offset the cost of that to the employer and, by the way, not add any cost to the taxpayer.

That is something we ought to talk about as well. We are just taking money that we would have been spending anyway, and we are spending it a lot more productively.

Now, my friend is right. This is a new program. This is a new approach. So trying it out for a year, spending \$100 million—a lot of money—but obviously we would spend more this way if we would know this would be successful. But I can't help but think it will be successful.

It is important to note that this bill is actually, again, exceptionally bipar-

tisan. I was struck, as I hope my friend was, yesterday when we were in Rules Committee considering this legislation. We are used to seeing the members of the Ways and Means Committee come up and sort of fight in front of us. Instead, they actually came up arm in arm with a bipartisan proposal that they had agreed to that, again, is an excellent, excellent work.

It is exactly the way that Congress should work, quite frankly: find common ground and advance commonsense solutions that make life better for the American people. In this case, at least, I think we have succeeded in doing that.

It is also important to note that the rule authorizes the consideration of H.R. 2353, the so-called Perkins grant program. The Perkins grant is something we are pretty familiar with in Oklahoma. This is Federal money that moves into career tech systems that helps actually, again, workers acquire the necessary skills to be productive, quite often, again, working with the employer who has already got the jobs available. We then train the worker at a career tech system partly funded with Federal dollars, and that person is assured the job the day they walk out.

I suspect that bill, like this bill, when it finally reaches the floor will also have substantial bipartisan support. I want to pledge to my good friend that we are going to continue to work together on things like this. I don't think anybody disagrees about putting Americans back to work. Workers would rather be at work than, frankly, just receiving government assistance and not able to go work. So this bill does that.

I want to urge support of the rule and, again, the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the underlying legislation, which includes my amendment expanding apprenticeships for American workers.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting this important effort in the Ways and Means Committee, and I look forward to its passage.

We can all agree that helping people find long-term employment in a high-demand industry is one of the best ways to ensure that everyone has economic security. But technological advancements like automation and artificial intelligence are dramatically shifting the way our economy works, and these changes are only going to accelerate.

We cannot allow American workers to be left behind. Congress needs to be forward looking, not reactive, in crafting policies that help workers who are displaced from the workforce. I believe that means we need a national

commitment to addressing the skills gap and mitigating disruption in an evolving 21st century economy.

Apprenticeships and on-the-job training are an important part of that equation. Apprenticeships can be an incredible opportunity for businesses and workers alike.

□ 1245

They allow employers to build a pipeline of qualified workers while equipping job seekers with the specific skills they need to find and keep good-paying jobs.

Oftentimes, they provide skills that are portable and meaningful anywhere in the country, giving workers more freedom to transfer between companies and industries.

In my home State of Washington, investments and apprenticeships have been shown to give a higher return on investment than any other job training program, returning \$23 for each dollar that is invested.

It is important to remember these investments not only have an incredible impact on our economy but also on people's lives by helping them become more self-sufficient through specialized training and increased earning potential.

I appreciate my colleague's bipartisan support for this amendment, and I urge its passage in the underlying legislation.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Decades of experience tell us that the most effective antipoverty program is a job, and this bill helps low-income Americans earn success through the dignity of work.

States actually, as my good friends on the other side know, spend very little of their TANF funding on moving people into jobs. Today, half of all TANF recipients are neither working nor preparing for work. This bill ensures that money only goes to those who are working, providing individuals with paychecks in lieu of benefit checks, a key tenet in welfare reform.

This pilot only provides funding for one fiscal year, repurposing money that has already been appropriated and, frankly, using it in a better way than it was originally appropriated to achieve.

The bill requires that States report on outcome measures and provide high-quality evaluations so that Congress can make appropriate decisions after we have actually seen the results yielded by the program.

And finally, as we have been pointing out, but I think around here it is always worth pointing out multiple times, where actually CBO estimates the bill has no cost. So we are actually doing something good without increasing expenditures for the taxpayers, and, indeed, we are probably in the process of creating new taxpayers, people who can contribute to the wealth and the activity and the prosperity of the country; and people, honestly, who

want to contribute to the wealth and the activity; and employers who want to provide people with an opportunity to improve themselves and become more productive.

So it is a good bill all the way around, and, again, I will be urging the passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

President Donald John Trump campaigned on the promise of job creation; however, his budget paints a very different picture. It cuts job training programs by 39 percent, and its radical spending cuts would lead to massive job losses.

In this body, we talk a lot about jobs, but we are 6 months into this Congress and have failed to pass any major job creation bills. While the bipartisan legislation before us today is, indeed, as my good friend points out, a step in the right direction, we can and we must do more.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I have an amendment in my hand that will generate thousands of American jobs. If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative DEFAZIO's bipartisan bill, H.R. 2510, the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act. This bill will create thousands of new American jobs through increased investment in our Nation's wastewater infrastructure. Here is a chance to take today's momentum a step further and consider Mr. DEFAZIO's bill in addition to the bipartisan TANF bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my very good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee who will discuss our proposal.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity. As he noted, the President has talked and tweeted incessantly about creating jobs and infrastructure investment, but, unfortunately, the only substantive proposal to come out of the White House that relates to infrastructure, infrastructure investment, and jobs is in his budget, and it actually reduces Federal investment in infrastructure, which would basically eliminate jobs.

So I mean, the bill before us today, bipartisan bill on apprenticeships is great, but you have got to apprentice for something that is real: a job in the end, construction.

America is falling apart, and, right now, we have nothing but rhetoric coming out of the White House, and now ideology. They are talking about privatizing all of the infrastructure in the United States so that you will pay tolls everywhere you go, and, you know, they call it asset recycling. They have come up with a catchy new name. That has been floated, but they haven't put any substance behind it.

So this amendment would allow the House to debate and pass H.R. 2510, Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. This bill would provide \$25 billion in direct infrastructure investment over the next 5 years to address America's crumbling wastewater infrastructure and local water quality challenges.

The state of our water infrastructure, according to the American Society of Engineers' report card of 2017, is a D-plus. Meanwhile, municipalities across the country have a backlog of more than \$40 billion—B, billion—in clean water infrastructure projects, and, according to the EPA, communities need close to \$300 billion over the next 20 years to bring their systems into a state of good repair.

It is clear that we cannot continue to neglect the serious needs of our aging water infrastructure. As these systems fail and degrade, they pose a risk to the health and safety of our citizens and obviously the environment.

I know the President promised, during his campaign, to make clean water a priority. I agree with that. He promised to triple funding for State revolving loan fund programs to help States and local governments upgrade critical drinking water and wastewater infrastructure.

Well, here is a chance to deliver on that promise. H.R. 2510 does exactly that. It triples investment in America's crumbling water infrastructure.

I was a county commissioner at a time when the Federal Government was a good partner, and, in those days, they put up 85 percent of the cost of our wastewater system. We put up the other 15. You know, this could—by renewing this legislation and a commitment to the State revolving loan fund programs and adding in a grant component for lower income areas, that could, you know, be a great step in terms of Federal partnership and creating actual jobs for the apprentices that this bill wants to create.

There is widespread support for this legislation. I include in the RECORD letters of endorsement from 30 separate groups.

OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL,
Columbus, OH.

Hon. GARRET GRAVES,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRAVES AND RANKING MEMBER NAPOLITANO: On behalf of the Ohio Environmental Council, I am writing to enthusiastically support the Water Quality

Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. This bill bolsters the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) by authorizing \$20 billion over five years for loans to improve wastewater infrastructure in local communities. It also provides crucial additional funding to help states control water pollution and address challenges from outdated sewer systems.

The need for this bill has never been greater as the nation faces a \$40 billion backlog of clean water infrastructure projects, with cities and towns needing \$300 billion over 20 years to update their water systems. In Ohio, the American Society of Civil Engineers found our state needs a total \$14.58 billion for wastewater improvements. The Clean Water SRF is an essential resource to help meet this need.

The Water Pollution Control Loan Fund (WPCLF) program, Ohio's Clean Water SRF, continues to provide fundamental capacity to improve water quality for Ohio communities and residents. The program includes several different loan options that help both cities and rural communities prevent water pollution. This includes funding to upgrade and replace Home Sewage Treatment Systems (HSTS), as well as assistance for wastewater collection and treatment, stormwater activities, and efforts to reduce nonpoint source pollution. Interest from the WPCLF program funds the preservation and restoration of aquatic habitat to counter the loss of natural systems that helped maintain the health of Ohio's water resources.

Since its inception the Clean Water SRF has provided \$7.2 billion serving 621 villages, cities, counties and sewer districts helping to curb pollution while providing quality jobs. To ensure this program's continuing success and help Ohio address our water infrastructure needs, I urge your support for the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017.

Sincerely,

HEATHER TAYLOR-MIESLE,
Executive Director.

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
SANITATION AGENCIES,
Sacramento, CA.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, Committee on Public Works and Transportation, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBERS DEFAZIO AND NAPOLITANO: The California Association of Sanitation Agencies (CASA) is pleased to support your efforts to address the water infrastructure funding gap and specifically the introduction of the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. For 60 years, CASA has been the leading voice for California's public wastewater agencies on regulatory, legislative and legal issues.

CASA agencies are faced with mounting challenges of aging infrastructure, growing demands from increasing population, and emerging challenges from changing climate conditions. Confronted with these realities, there is clear demand for increased infrastructure investment, including the need to invest in water recycling infrastructure and clean energy facilities derived from the wastewater treatment process.

Under your legislation, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) would be renewed at \$20 billion over five years. This authorization represents a critical down payment toward a robust federal commitment to the nation's water infrastructure needs. According to the report, the financial burden to

simply meet water quality and water-related public health goals of the Clean Water Act (CWA) in California was in excess of \$26 billion in 2012. Due to drought conditions and other strains on our wastewater systems, that figure has only gone up over the last 5 years. Nationwide the demand for all clean and drinking water infrastructure needs has been estimated at more than \$300 billion over the next two decades. CASA also supports the bill's provisions to authorize grant assistance for water recycling as well as the programs to address stormwater flows and combined sewer overflows. In California, the ability to construct water-recycling projects is vital to a safe and reliable water supply and to ensure protection of our ecosystems.

As you and your colleagues work to develop a comprehensive water infrastructure policy for the nation, we look forward to working with you to advance meaningful federal assistance programs.

ADAM D. LINK,
Director of Government Affairs.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,
Washington, DC, May 2, 2017.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) supports The Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017 to provide needed funds to fix the nation's wastewater treatment systems.

The nation's wastewater treatment systems are the most basic and critical infrastructure systems for protecting public health and the environment, but are badly underfunded. Nearly 240 million Americans—76% of the population—rely on the nation's 14,748 treatment plants for wastewater sanitation. By 2032 it is expected that 56 million more people will connect to centralized treatment plants, rather than private septic systems—a 23% increase in demand. In the U.S., there are over 800,000 miles of public sewers and 500,000 miles of private lateral sewers connecting private property to public sewer lines. Each of these conveyance systems is susceptible to structural failure, blockages, and overflows.

In March, ASCE released its 2017 Infrastructure Report Card, which graded our nation's wastewater systems a "D+." Many wastewater systems are aging and it's expected that over the next two decades, requiring at least \$271 billion to meet current and future demands.

This legislation is an important step towards meeting our country's wastewater investment needs and improving our wastewater systems.

Sincerely,

BRIAN PALLASCH,
Managing Director, Government Relations & Infrastructure Initiatives.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK,
May 2, 2017.

Re WIN's Strong Support for the Water Quality Improvement and Job Creation Act.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: The Water Infrastructure Network (WIN), a coalition of the nation's leading construction, engineering, municipal, conservation, public works, labor and manufacturing organizations, strongly supports the Water Quality Improvement and Job Creation Act. WIN also commends your continued work to reauthorize our nation's critical water infrastructure funding programs. The United

States is facing a water infrastructure funding crisis as documented in recent reports by CBO, EPA and WIN pointing to a shortfall in funding for clean water infrastructure that exceeds \$300 Billion over the next two decades. The Clean Water Act was last reauthorized in 1987 and WIN believes that consideration and passage of legislation providing substantial increased investment in America's Water Infrastructure is long overdue.

WIN is encouraged by the growing bipartisan support in Congress for investing in our nation's clean water infrastructure. The FY '17 Appropriation Package released this week calls for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to be funded at \$1.39 Billion—a \$414 M increase over the original FY '17 funding request. The Trump Administration has also made investments in our nation's water infrastructure a top priority for the Environmental Protection Agency, requesting increases in funding for both the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act State Revolving Funds in their 2018 Budget.

WIN believes Congress must seize this unique opportunity make long overdue investments in our nation's critical water infrastructure. Investments in water infrastructure make eminent economic and environmental sense for our nation. WIN is committed to working with you and the bipartisan leadership of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to advance water infrastructure funding legislation in the First Session of the 115th Congress.

Sincerely,

The WIN Executive Committee—American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC), American Public Works Association (APWA), American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Associated General Contractors of America (AGCA), International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE), Laborers International Union of North America (LIUNA), National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA), National Rural Water Association (NRWA), United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters (The United), and the Vinyl Institute (VI).

OREGON WATER RESOURCES CONGRESS,
Salem, Oregon, May 3, 2017.

Re The Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Washington, DC.

REPRESENTATIVE DEFAZIO: On behalf of the Oregon Water Resources Congress (OWRC), I am writing to express our support of Congressman DeFazio's efforts to reauthorize the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and tackle the water quality financing needs in the country under The Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. The CWSRF is an effective program that addresses critical water infrastructure needs while benefitting the environment, local communities, and the economy.

OWRC was established in 1912 as a trade association to support the protection of water rights and promote the wise stewardship of water resources statewide. OWRC members are local governmental entities, which include irrigation districts, water control districts, drainage districts, water improvement districts, and other agricultural water suppliers that deliver water to roughly 1/3 of all irrigated land in Oregon. These water stewards operate complex water management systems, including water supply reservoirs, canals, pipelines, and hydropower facilities that serve a diverse set of farmers, ranchers, and other water users contributing to the local and global economy.

The CWSRF is a perfect example of the type of program that should be reauthorized because it creates jobs while benefitting the environment, and is an efficient return on taxpayer investment. CWSRF funded projects provide family wage jobs in construction and professional services industry that are a crucial component to economic recovery in Oregon and other states. Moreover, as a loan program, it is a wise investment that allows local communities to leverage their limited resources and address critical infrastructure needs that would otherwise be unmet.

OWRC was very pleased to see the passage of the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (WIIN) by Congress in December last year. An integral piece of the funding puzzle for our member districts was reinstated by this act, irrigation district eligibility for principal forgiveness. The CWSRF is often an integral part of an overall package of state, federal and local funding that necessitates a stronger level of assurance that loan funds will be available for planned water infrastructure projects. Irrigation districts are often located in rural communities and have a small number of farmers with limited capacity to take on loan debt. Even a small reduction in the principal repayment obligations can make the difference in whether or not a district can move forward with a project.

The CWSRF program is an important tool utilized by OWRC members across Oregon, and we applaud this effort by Congressman DeFazio to reauthorize this key program. OWRC looks forward to working with the Committee and this Congress as the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017 moves forward.

Sincerely,

APRIL SNELL,
*Executive Director,
Oregon Water Resources Congress.*

SOUTHERN ENVIRONMENTAL
LAW CENTER,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2017.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
*Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. JIMMY DUNCAN,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO,
*Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources
and the Environment, Committee on
Transportation and Infrastructure, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES DEFAZIO, NAPOLITANO AND DUNCAN: Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC) writes in support of the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. At a time when much of our nation's infrastructure is at a breaking point, bolstering our national infrastructure funds is more critical than ever. Thank you for your leadership on clean water infrastructure investment.

This bill authorizes \$20 billion in Federal grants over five years to capitalize Clean Water State Revolving Funds (Clean Water SRF). Across the country, many communities are struggling with how to pay for needed investments and upgrades to infrastructure that protects clean water and public health. According to the 2012 Clean Watersheds Needs Survey, municipalities need close to \$300 billion in investment over the next 20 years to bring their wastewater and stormwater management infrastructure to a state of good repair.

The Clean Water SRF provides a critical source of funding to states to address water infrastructure needs and reduce pollution from stormwater and wastewater across the

country. This legislation will help communities address the estimated \$40 billion backlog in clean water infrastructure projects. Additionally, this investment in our water infrastructure is good for the economy. The report Water Works: Rebuilding infrastructure, Creating Jobs and Greening the Environment shows that investments in our water infrastructure, including green infrastructure, would conservatively yield 1.9 million American jobs and add \$265 billion to the economy.

This legislation authorizes \$20 billion in Federal grants over five years for the Clean Water SRF to provide low-interest loans and additional loan subsidizations to communities for wastewater infrastructure. We are supportive of efforts to increase the resiliency of treatment works to natural or man-made disasters. In the face of a changing climate, resiliency of our nation's infrastructure is increasingly important.

Also, this legislation authorizes \$2.5 billion over five years for grants to address combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) and recapture and reuse of municipal stormwater. CSOs and SSOs pose a significant health and safety risk to communities and can damage local economies that are dependent on clean water and tourism. We are supportive of funds to address this ongoing problem that can cost communities significant resources to address.

Economists estimate that between 20,000 and 26,600 construction, engineering, and manufacturing jobs are created for every billion dollars of federal investment in water infrastructure. Investments in the Clean Water SRFs are critical to protect public health, promote job creation, and restore clean water in our rivers, lakes, and streams.

SELC appreciates your leadership on clean water infrastructure investment and your continued work on reducing pollution related to aging and inadequately funded infrastructure.

Sincerely,

NAVIS A. BERMUDEZ,
*Deputy Legislative Director,
Southern Environmental Law Center.*

Mr. DEFAZIO. And according to the National Utility Contractors Association, every billion dollars invested in our Nation's water infrastructure creates or sustains 27,000 real jobs in the private sector. That means that the \$20 billion in Federal investment in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, including H.R. 2510, would create or sustain approximately 540,000 jobs.

This is real. It is real. Real jobs for real people and real improvements in the infrastructure of this country. This would be a great step forward, and I urge that my colleagues adopt the amendment.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have been having such a wonderful bipartisan moment here. My good friend from Oregon, and appropriately, wants to change the tenor a little bit.

Let me begin by actually congratulating my good friend from Oregon because he is a serious legislator and does serious things, and I am probably going to find myself on the same side with him on the issue of air traffic controllers where I think his points have been very well made.

On this particular piece of legislation, I must admit, I have not had the

opportunity. I don't sit on my friend's committee to actually read it, but I suspect the committee hasn't picked it up and dealt with it either.

And just from a process standpoint, I think the appropriate thing to do would be for the committee to actually review it. It could be amended in committee, as indeed this bill was, and then we would have the opportunity to consider it on the floor. But to bring it to the floor immediately, to me, is premature, legislatively.

I also want to take issue, on the record, with my friends of the President of the United States in terms of job creation. I suspect President Trump, in his private life, has created more jobs than just about anybody in the Congress of the United States, and I think he has laid forward some incredibly important proposals to continue and build on his personal record, now that he is President of the United States.

One of those proposals, as my friends are surely aware, because I think they largely agree with it, is to enhance the apprenticeship program announcement he made recently. Another one that my friends may not be quite so much in agreement with, he has laid out his principles for tax reform.

The greatest engine for job growth is never going to be the Federal Government. It is going to always be the private sector. And if we could, as the President has suggested, cut corporate tax rates, incentivize the return of profit, something where perhaps we can work together, that are stranded overseas, bring them back here and invest in America, I think we would create a lot more jobs a lot more quickly and in a lot more sustainable fashion than we would do through additional public spending.

Finally, I think we ought to give the President a little bit of credit for emphasizing and bringing home American jobs, something that actually began once he was President-elect. We saw it in Indiana with Carrier air-conditioning. We have seen it in other cases where he has promoted the sale of American arms in the Middle East where we have got substantial things.

So I think this is a President who actually gets up each and every day and thinks profoundly about what can we do to create an overall ecosystem, an environment, if you will, that will incentivize private investment, private employment, American jobs, and bringing American companies back to this country.

I think he is actually off to an exceptionally good start in those areas, and I look forward to working with him on that. I suspect we will see a tax proposal on this floor in the not-too-distant future—our friends on Ways and Means are working on it now—that will mirror many of the principles that the President laid out in his initial draft discussion of what he thinks we ought to do.

And that one change, changing the Tax Code, I think, will do more than

all the programs that we would work on, many of them worthy programs, many of them things, I think, where the Federal Government does have a role.

I will agree with my friend from Florida, I am disturbed about some of the cuts in training programs. I have seen those programs work and work well, and I suspect the President will find out—we used to routinely praise President Obama's budget on the floor. It never got very many votes. I don't think it ever got any Democratic votes—that, you know, Presidents propose, as they should, that is their prerogative, they run the executive branch, but, at the end of the day, it is Congress that makes the final funding decisions.

I happen to know a little bit about those programs because they come through my subcommittee on appropriations, and I want to assure my friends they are not going to disappear. And we may have to make some tough choices, as you always have to do, in appropriated dollars, but on many of the programs that I know my friend cares about and has championed in his distinguished career, they are going to be protected, and we are going to try and work in a bipartisan fashion in those areas and keep those things going.

But, at the end of the day, I think the President's record on job creation will be outstanding, and I think the actions that he has taken in the opening part of his administration are a testament to how seriously he takes the challenge of making sure that every American has a decent job, a job that pays a good wage, a job that will provide for his or her family, and a job that will give them an opportunity to live a life of dignity and prosperity, something we want every American to have a chance at.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I first want to address my good friend about the previous question and the fact that it has not gone through the process. I will just remind him that the chatter in Washington today is about a healthcare measure that hasn't gone through the process, at least to the extent that most of us would all want.

I also have great respect for my good friend from Oklahoma, and I know he will see and get a chance to talk with President Donald John Trump. I am not likely to.

□ 1300

But I would ask him to tell him when he sees him for me that I came here in 1993, and there were 14,000 bridges in need of repair in America, and last year the statistics from the society that does that analysis showed that there are 54,000 bridges in need of repair in this country. The point that I wish to make is that we need a serious substantial infrastructure measure.

Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about jobs in this Chamber. I was at a forum on Saturday, and someone mentioned: My governor's mantra is "jobs, jobs, jobs." And that person said: Well, he must mean that you have to have three jobs in order to get by.

I am glad that we are here today considering a bill that will help Americans in search of work to find a good-paying position that will help them support themselves and their families. We have a lot of issues facing us, and this bipartisan legislation is just one tiny step forward in the right direction. I hope this measure translates into more bipartisan bills.

Too often, from healthcare reform, tax reform—footnote right there. My friend mentions that we will likely see a tax reform measure sometime soon. I hope that it doesn't revert to trickle down. We have seen trickle down. It did not work, and I hope we don't do that again.

We have an opportunity on other issues, and in many respects the majority has shut out the minority from the process, just like what has happened until today, at least, in the other body with reference to healthcare.

The bills we have debated and even passed are projected to eliminate millions of jobs. Even as we talk about job creation, my friends across the aisle too frequently turn around and champion measures that would do just the opposite. There is so much room for cooperation in this area, yet time and time again we are kept out of the process, and the results speak for themselves. For the sake of our country, this needs to change.

Even though this is a bipartisan bill, it also serves as an example of what I mean. I was disappointed that my Republican colleagues in the Rules Committee blocked yesterday six germane amendments to this bill. It is a symptom of the closed process. When we prevent germane amendments from even being debated by the House, it does us all a disservice, yet my friends across the aisle do it again and again.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this: President Obama is credited for creating 11.3 million jobs in our country. The economy added jobs for 75 straight months, and very fortunately that carryover for the last 5 months has continued.

While President Donald John Trump makes untenable pledge after pledge, I watched every word of his speech last night in Iowa, and all I heard was platitudes. I didn't hear anything about substance. And it seemed like a road test for some new ideas. He makes these untenable pledges, including a very humble promise to be—and I quote him—"the greatest jobs producer that God ever created."

The record is clear, the Democratic Party is, has been, and will be the party of job creation, and is ready to work with my Republican colleagues to continue significant job creation in this country.

So I will ask my friends across the aisle, let us continue the trend of the past few years and work together to produce bipartisan measures that will benefit the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by addressing a couple of points that my friend made. There will be places we agree; there will be places we disagree. I think too often around here we talk about how nothing gets done when this has actually been an extraordinarily productive period in terms of passing legislation. We are going to have differences on some of that legislation, there is no question. There is a reason why God created a Democratic Party and a Republican Party, and it probably wasn't to always agree all the time, but it was to challenge one another and try to work together when they could or define alternative paths when they felt they must, and let the American people make the decision.

Fortunately, we are blessed to live in a country where they get to make that decision on a regular basis like clockwork. They have been making some decisions recently. I think the President has had a pretty good run in special elections. We are pretty pleased with the decisions they have been making. But at some point they will change their mind—they always do—and they will decide somebody else has a better way.

I think in the interim we ought to stress occasionally so the American people know when we do work together. I actually was home after we managed to pass healthcare through this particular body, and that bill moved through multiple committees, had multiple amendments, lots of negotiation. Obviously it is in the Senate now. I think that process will start over there. But the day before we passed it, actually, we came together in a really quite remarkable way. We passed an omnibus spending bill of over \$1 trillion. That bill had worked through the Appropriations Committee of each House, 12 different bills put together to fund the Federal Government. That particular bill gave us the largest increase in defense spending in about a decade, the largest increase in border security money in about a decade. It gave us a substantial increase in money at the National Institutes of Health and at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, areas that Democrats and Republicans alike have been working together on and feel very strongly about.

That bill also broke the one-to-one relationship—pretty artificial relationship, in my view—that President Obama had laid down that, if you increase defense spending, you have to automatically increase domestic spending whether you need to or not or whether you can afford to or not.

Frankly, that bill actually passed with a majority of my friends on the Democratic side in both the House and the Senate and a majority of Republicans in the House and the Senate voting for the same bill and Donald Trump signing the bill.

Now, when I go home and I explain that to people, they look at me with a blank stare. It is like: What? That really happened? One trillion dollars with all those different elements in there and a majority of Democrats voted for it and a majority of Republicans voted for it and Donald Trump signed it?

I say: Yeah.

They are amazed. They have never heard about it. They have never seen it. I think that is because sometimes we present a false narrative of constant conflict. There is certainly plenty of conflict here. Look, I have some sympathy with the minority. Having been in the minority myself, you always feel shut out. But this is an occasion—this legislation, and, frankly, that spending bill—when my friends certainly weren't shut out. They participated, and they participated vigorously, and they contributed in the process.

I am with my friend. We need to do more of that. As a matter of fact, I think you will see it is happening right now. If you go to the Defense Committee, they are working on their authorization bill. That committee is the most bipartisan committee probably in Congress. Every time they report something out on an authorization—I think they have 63 or 64 members, something like that—the vote is always like 60 to 3. They have clearly put aside their partisan differences to work together.

In this bill, we have done exactly the same thing. So while we are going to have some points where we disagree, we are going to have some opportunities to agree and come together. And I pledge to my friend I will continue to work with him to try and see that we find more of them.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to encourage all of the Members, obviously, to support the rule, but I am sure my good friends on the other side probably won't accept the invitation. That is okay. This is a process vote and they have got other matters they want on the floor, and I certainly understand that they will be opposing our rule and trying to offer an alternative.

But when the matter counts, when the actual legislation reaches the floor, I think H.R. 2842 will draw broad bipartisan support. This House is taking steps to help workers leave welfare rolls and return to the workforce. Under this bill, employers will be incentivized to hire TANF recipients and will help bring the unemployed up into the workforce and the economy.

This bill is a commonsense bipartisan solution that will benefit everyone: the workers, the employers, the community, the economy, and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud my colleagues on the other side of the aisle

for their work on this important piece of legislation. I think if we can get it through this House and we get it through the Senate, I am sure that Mr. Trump will be more than happy to sign it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 396 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2510) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2510.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 184, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

YEAS—226

Abraham	Blackburn	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Blum	Chabot
Allen	Bost	Chaffetz
Amash	Brady (TX)	Cheney
Amodel	Brat	Coffman
Arrington	Bridenstine	Cole
Babin	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Bacon	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Barletta	Buchanan	Comer
Barr	Buck	Comstock
Barton	Bucshon	Conaway
Bergman	Budd	Cook
Biggs	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Bilirakis	Byrne	Cramer
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Crawford
Black	Carter (GA)	Culberson

Curbelo (FL)

Davidson

Davis, Rodney

Denham

Dent

DeSantis

DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart

Donovan

Duffy

Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)

Dunn

Emmer

Estes (KS)

Farenthold

Faso

Ferguson

Fitzpatrick

Fleischmann

Flores

Fortenberry

Fox

Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen

Gaetz

Gallagher

Garrett

Gianforte

Gibbs

Gohmert

Goodlatte

Gosar

Gowdy

Granger

Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)

Griffith

Grothman

Guthrie

Harper

Harris

Hartzler

Hensarling

Herrera Beutler

Hice, Jody B.

Higgins (LA)

Hill

Holding

Hollingsworth

Hudson

Huizenga

Hultgren

Hunter

Hurd

Issa

Jenkins (KS)

Jenkins (WV)

Johnson (OH)

Jones

Jordan

Joyce (OH)

Katko

Kelly (MS)

Kelly (PA)

King (IA)

King (NY)

Kinzinger

Knight

Kustoff (TN)

Labrador

LaHood

LaMalfa

Lamborn

Latta

Lewis (MN)

LoBiondo

Loudermilk

Love

Lucas

Luetkemeyer

MacArthur

Marchant

Marino

Marshall

Massie

Mast

McCarthy

McCaul

McClintock

McHenry

McKinley

McMorris

Rodgers

McSally

Meadows

Meehan

Mitchell

Moolenaar

Mooney (WV)

Mullin

Murphy (PA)

Newhouse

Noem

Nunes

Olson

Palazzo

Palmer

Paulsen

Pearce

Pittenger

Poe (TX)

Poliquin

Posey

Reichert

Renacci

Rice (SC)

Roby

Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)

Rohrabacher

Rokita

Rooney, Francis

Rooney, Thomas

J.

Ros-Lehtinen

Ross

Rothfus

Rouzer

Royce (CA)

Russell

Rutherford

Simpson

Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)

Smucker

Stefanik

Stewart

Stivers

Taylor

Tenney

Thompson (PA)

Thornberry

Tipton

Turner

Upton

Valadao

Wagner

Walberg

Walden

Walker

Walorski

Walters, Mimi

Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)

Westerman

Williams

Wilson (SC)

Wittman

Womack

Woodall

Yoder

Yoho

Young (AK)

Young (IA)

Zeldin

Maloney,

Carolyn B.

Maloney, Sean

Matsui

McCollum

McEachin

McGovern

McNerney

Meng

Moore

Moulton

Murphy (FL)

Nadler

Neal

Nolan

Norcross

O'Halleran

O'Rourke

Pallone

Panetta

Pascrell

Payne

Pelosi

Perlmutter

Peters

Peterson

Banks (IN)

Bishop (UT)

Cummings

DeLauro

Gabbard

Johnson (LA)

Johnson, Sam

Keating

Pingree

Pocan

Polis

Price (NC)

Quigley

Raskin

Rice (NY)

Richmond

Rosen

Roybal-Allard

Ruiz

Ruppersberger

Rush

Ryan (OH)

Sánchez

Sarbanes

Schakowsky

Schiff

Schneider

Schrader

Scott (VA)

Scott, David

Serrano

Sewell (AL)

Shea-Porter

Sherman

Lance

Larsen (WA)

Lieu, Ted

Long

Meeks

Messer

Napolitano

Perry

Sinema

Sires

Slaughter

Smith (WA)

Soto

Speier

Suozi

Swalwell (CA)

Takano

Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)

Titus

Tonko

Torres

Tsongas

Vargas

Veasey

Vela

Velázquez

Visclosky

Walz

Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman

Welch

Wilson (FL)

Yarmuth

Buchanan

Buck

Bucshon

Budd

Burgess

Byrne

Calvert

Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)

Chabot

Chaffetz

Cheney

Coffman

Cole

Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)

Comer

Comstock

Conaway

Cook

Costa

Costello (PA)

Cramer

Crawford

Crist

Culberson

Curbelo (FL)

Davidson

Davis, Rodney

Denham

Dent

DeSantis

DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart

Donovan

Duffy

Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)

Dunn

Emmer

Estes (KS)

Farenthold

Flores

Fortenberry

Fox

Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen

Gaetz

Gallagher

Garrett

Gianforte

Gibbs

Gohmert

Goodlatte

Gosar

Gottheimer

Gowdy

Granger

Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)

Griffith

Grothman

Guthrie

Harper

Harris

Hartzler

Hensarling

Herrera Beutler

Hice, Jody B.

Higgins (LA)

Hill

Holding

Hollingsworth

Hudson

Huizenga

Hultgren

Hunter

Hurd

Issa

Jenkins (KS)

Jenkins (WV)

Johnson (OH)

Posey

Ratcliffe

Reed

Reichert

Renacci

Rice (SC)

Roby

Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)

Rohrabacher

Rokita

Rooney, Francis

Rooney, Thomas

J.

Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam

Ross

Rothfus

Rouzer

Royce (CA)

Russell

Rutherford

Sanford

Schneider

Schweikert

Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner

Sessions

Shimkus

Shuster

Simpson

Sinema

Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)

Smucker

Stefanik

Stewart

Stivers

Taylor

Tenney

Thompson (PA)

Thornberry

Tipton

Trott

Turner

Upton

Valadao

Wagner

Walberg

Walden

Walker

Walorski

Walters, Mimi

Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)

Westerman

Williams

Wilson (SC)

Wittman

Womack

Woodall

Yoder

Yoho

Young (AK)

Young (IA)

Zeldin

NAYS—184

Adams

Aguilar

Barragán

Bass

Beatty

Bera

Beyer

Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer

Blunt Rochester

Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan

F.

Brady (PA)

Brown (MD)

Brownley (CA)

Bustos

Butterfield

Capuano

Carbajal

Cardenas

Carson (IN)

Cartwright

Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)

Chu, Judy

Cicilline

Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)

Clay

Cleaver

Clyburn

Cohen

Connolly

Conyers

Cooper

Correa

Costa

Courtney

Crist

Crowley

Cuellar

Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny

DeFazio

DeGette

Delaney

DelBene

Demings

DeSaulnier

Deutch

Dingell

Doggett

Doyle, Michael

F.

Ellison

Engel

Eshoo

Espallat

Esty (CT)

Evans

Foster

Frankel (FL)

Fudge

Gallego

Garamendi

Gonzalez (TX)

Gottheimer

Green, Al

Green, Gene

Grijalva

Gutiérrez

Hanabusa

Hastings

Heck

Higgins (NY)

Himes

Hoyer

Huffman

Jackson Lee

Jayapal

Jeffries

Johnson (GA)

Johnson, E. B.

Kaptur

Kelly (IL)

Kennedy

Khanna

Kihuen

Kildee

Kilmer

Kind

Krishnamoorthi

Kuster (NH)

Langevin

Larson (CT)

Esty (CT)

Lawrence

Lawson (FL)

Lee

Levin

Lewis (GA)

Lipinski

Loeb

Lofgren

Lowenthal

Lowe

Lujan

Lujan Grisham,

M.

Lujan, Ben Ray

Lynch

Abraham

Allen

Amash

Amodei

Arrington

Babin

Bacon

Banks (IN)

Barletta

Barr

Barton

Bergman

Biggs

Bilirakis

Bishop (MI)

Black

Blackburn

Blum

Bost

Brady (TX)

Brat

Bridenstine

Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)

NOT VOTING—21

□ 1333

Ms. SINEMA and Mr. CRIST changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING SERVICEMEMBERS KILLED ABOARD USS “FITZGERALD”

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the USS *Fitzgerald* collided with a container ship off the coast of Japan. Seven of our brave servicemembers were killed in the collision.

I ask my colleagues to join me in a moment of silence to honor the brave sailors who gave the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 179, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—233

Adams

Aguilar

Barragán

Bass

Beatty

Bera

Beyer

Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer

Blunt Rochester

Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan

F.

Brady (PA)

Brown (MD)

Brownley (CA)

Bustos

Butterfield

Capuano

Carbajal

Cardenas

Carson (IN)

Cartwright

Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)

Chu, Judy

Cicilline

Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)

Clay

Cleaver

Clyburn

Cohen

Connolly

Conyers

Cooper

Correa

Cicilline

Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)

Clay

Cleaver

Clyburn

Cohen

Connolly

Conyers

Cooper

Correa

Doyle, Michael

F.

Ellison

Engel

Eshoo

Espallat

Esty (CT)

Evans

Foster

Frankel (FL)

Fudge

Gallego

Garamendi

Gonzalez (TX)

Green, Al

Green, Gene

Grijalva

Gutiérrez

Hanabusa

Heck

Higgins (NY)

Himes

Hoyer

Huffman

Jackson Lee

Jayapal

NOES—179

Adams

Aguilar

Barragán

Bass

Beatty

Bera

Beyer

Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer

Blunt Rochester

Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan

F.

Brady (PA)

Brown (MD)

Brownley (CA)

Bustos

Butterfield

Capuano

Carbajal

Cardenas

Carson (IN)

Cartwright

Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)

Chu, Judy

Cicilline

Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)

Clay

Cleaver

Clyburn

Cohen

Connolly

Conyers

Cooper

Correa

Courtney

Crowley

Cuellar

Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny

DeFazio

DeGette

Delaney

DeLauro

DelBene

Demings

DeSaulnier

Deutch

Dingell

Doggett

Doyle, Michael

F.

Ellison

Engel

Eshoo

Espallat

Esty (CT)

Evans

Foster

Frankel (FL)

Fudge

Gallego

Garamendi

Gonzalez (TX)

Green, Al

Green, Gene

Grijalva

Gutiérrez

Hanabusa

Heck

Higgins (NY)

Himes

Hoyer

Huffman

Jackson Lee

Jayapal

Jeffries	McEachin	Sarbanes
Johnson (GA)	McGovern	Schakowsky
Johnson, E. B.	McNerney	Schiff
Kaptur	Meng	Schrader
Keating	Moore	Scott (VA)
Kelly (IL)	Moulton	Scott, David
Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Serrano
Khanna	Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Kihuen	Neal	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Nolan	Sherman
Kilmer	Norcross	Sires
Kind	O'Halleran	Slaughter
Krishnamoorthi	O'Rourke	Smith (WA)
Kuster (NH)	Pallone	Soto
Langevin	Panetta	Speier
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Suozi
Lawrence	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Lawson (FL)	Pelosi	Takano
Lee	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Peters	Thompson (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Peterson	Titus
Lipinski	Pingree	Tonko
Loeback	Pocan	Torres
Lofgren	Polis	Tsongas
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lowe	Quigley	Veasey
Lujan Grisham,	Raskin	Vela
M.	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond	Visclosky
Lynch	Rosen	Walz
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
Carolyn B.	Ruppersberger	Watson Coleman
Maloney, Sean	Rush	Welch
Matsui	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (FL)
McCollum	Sánchez	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Bishop (UT)	Lieu, Ted	Scalise
Cummins	Long	Tiberi
Gabbard	Meeks	Wasserman
Hastings	Messer	Schultz
Johnson, Sam	Napolitano	Wenstrup
Lance	Perry	

□ 1342

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today for rollcall vote No. 317. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unexpectedly detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 316, and "yea" on rollcall No. 317.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I missed two votes on June 22. If I were present, I would have voted on the following: Rollcall No. 316: On Ordering the Previous Question, "yea." Rollcall No. 317: On Passage of H. Res. 396, "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 316 and No. 317 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2842. I would have also voted "nay" on H. Res. 396—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2842—Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

REPORT ON H.R. 2998, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-188) on the bill

(H.R. 2998) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules if a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on the postponed question at a later time.

STRENGTHENING CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2353) to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2353

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
Sec. 3. References.
Sec. 4. Effective date.
Sec. 5. Table of contents of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

Sec. 6. Purpose.
Sec. 7. Definitions.
Sec. 8. Transition provisions.
Sec. 9. Prohibitions.
Sec. 10. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE I—CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION
Sec. 110. Reservations and State allotment.
Sec. 111. Within State allocation.
Sec. 112. Accountability.
Sec. 113. National activities.
Sec. 114. Assistance for the outlying areas.
Sec. 115. Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions.
Sec. 116. Occupational and employment information.

PART B—STATE PROVISIONS

Sec. 121. State plan.
Sec. 122. Improvement plans.
Sec. 123. State leadership activities.

PART C—LOCAL PROVISIONS
Sec. 131. Local application for career and technical education programs.
Sec. 132. Local uses of funds.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Federal and State administrative provisions.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGNER-PEYSEYER ACT

Sec. 301. State responsibilities.

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect beginning on July 1, 2018.

SEC. 5. TABLE OF CONTENTS OF THE CARL D. PERKINS CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT OF 2006.

Section 1(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

"Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

"Sec. 2. Purpose.

"Sec. 3. Definitions.

"Sec. 4. Transition provisions.

"Sec. 5. Privacy.

"Sec. 6. Limitation.

"Sec. 7. Special rule.

"Sec. 8. Prohibitions.

"Sec. 9. Authorization of appropriations.

"TITLE I—CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

"PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION

"Sec. 111. Reservations and State allotment.

"Sec. 112. Within State allocation.

"Sec. 113. Accountability.

"Sec. 114. National activities.

"Sec. 115. Assistance for the outlying areas.

"Sec. 116. Native American programs.

"Sec. 117. Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions.

"PART B—STATE PROVISIONS

"Sec. 121. State administration.

"Sec. 122. State plan.

"Sec. 123. Improvement plans.

"Sec. 124. State leadership activities.

"PART C—LOCAL PROVISIONS

"Sec. 131. Distribution of funds to secondary education programs.

"Sec. 132. Distribution of funds for postsecondary education programs.

"Sec. 133. Special rules for career and technical education.

"Sec. 134. Local application for career and technical education programs.

"Sec. 135. Local uses of funds.

"TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"PART A—FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Sec. 211. Fiscal requirements.

"Sec. 212. Authority to make payments.

"Sec. 213. Construction.

"Sec. 214. Voluntary selection and participation.

"Sec. 215. Limitation for certain students.

"Sec. 216. Federal laws guaranteeing civil rights.

"Sec. 217. Participation of private school personnel and children.

"Sec. 218. Limitation on Federal regulations.

"Sec. 219. Study on programs of study aligned to high-skill, high-wage occupations.

"PART B—STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Sec. 221. Joint funding.

"Sec. 222. Prohibition on use of funds to induce out-of-State relocation of businesses.

"Sec. 223. State administrative costs.

"Sec. 224. Student assistance and other Federal programs."

SEC. 6. PURPOSE.

Section 2 (20 U.S.C. 2301) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—
(A) by striking “academic and career and technical skills” and inserting “academic knowledge and technical and employability skills”; and

(B) by inserting “and programs of study” after “technical education programs”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “, including tech prep education”; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by inserting “and programs of study” after “technical education programs”.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 (20 U.S.C. 2302) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (16), (23), (24), (25), (26), and (32);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (8), (9), (10), (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), (22), (27), (28), (29), (30), (31), (33), and (34) as paragraphs (9), (10), (13), (16), (17), (19), (20), (23), (25), (27), (28), (30), (32), (35), (39), (40), (41), (44), (45), (46), and (47), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “5 different occupational fields to individuals” and inserting “three different fields, especially in in-demand industry sectors or occupations, that are available to all students”; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking “not fewer than 5 different occupational fields” and inserting “not fewer than three different occupational fields”;

(4) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking “coherent and rigorous content aligned with challenging academic standards” and inserting “content at the secondary level aligned with the challenging State academic standards adopted by a State under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)), and at the postsecondary level with the rigorous academic content,”;

(II) by striking “and skills” and inserting “and skills.”; and

(III) by inserting “, including in in-demand industry sectors or occupations” before the semicolon at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking “, an industry-recognized credential, a certificate, or an associate degree” and inserting “or a recognized postsecondary credential, which may include an industry-recognized credential”; and

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by inserting “, work-based, or other” after “competency-based”;

(ii) by striking “contributes to the” and inserting “supports the development of”;

(iii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by striking “general”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) to the extent practicable, coordinate between secondary and postsecondary education programs, which may include early college programs with articulation agreements, dual or concurrent enrollment program opportunities, or programs of study; and

“(D) may include career exploration at the high school level or as early as the middle grades (as such term is defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)).”;

(5) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “(and parents, as appropriate)” and inserting “(and, as appropriate, parents and out-of-school youth)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “financial aid,” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “financial aid, job training, secondary and postsecondary options (including baccalaureate degree programs), dual or concurrent enrollment programs, work-based learning opportunities, and support services.”;

(6) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) CAREER PATHWAYS.—The term ‘career pathways’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”;

(7) by inserting after paragraph (10) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(11) CTE CONCENTRATOR.—The term ‘CTE concentrator’ means—

“(A) at the secondary school level, a student served by an eligible recipient who has—

“(i) completed three or more career and technical education courses; or

“(ii) completed at least two courses in a single career and technical education program or program of study; or

“(B) at the postsecondary level, a student enrolled in an eligible recipient who has—

“(i) earned at least 12 cumulative credits within a career and technical education program or program of study; or

“(ii) completed such a program if the program encompasses fewer than 12 credits or the equivalent in total.

“(12) CTE PARTICIPANT.—The term ‘CTE participant’ means an individual who completes not less than one course or earns not less than one credit in a career and technical education program or program of study of an eligible recipient.”;

(8) by inserting after paragraph (13) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(14) DUAL OR CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT.—The term ‘dual or concurrent enrollment’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).”;

“(15) EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL.—The term ‘early college high school’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).”;

(9) by inserting after paragraph (17) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(18) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means a consortium that—

“(A) shall include at least two of the following:

“(i) a local educational agency;

“(ii) an educational service agency;

“(iii) an eligible institution;

“(iv) an area career and technical education school;

“(v) a State educational agency; or

“(vi) the Bureau of Indian Education;

“(B) may include a regional, State, or local public or private organization, including a community-based organization, one or more employers, or a qualified intermediary; and

“(C) is led by an entity or partnership of entities described in subparagraph (A).”;

(10) by amending paragraph (19) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) to read as follows:

“(19) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—The term ‘eligible institution’ means—

“(A) a consortium of two or more of the entities described in subparagraphs (B) through (F);

“(B) a public or nonprofit private institution of higher education that offers and will use funds provided under this title in support of career and technical education courses that lead to technical skill proficiency, an industry-recognized credential, a certificate, or an associate degree;

“(C) a local educational agency providing education at the postsecondary level;

“(D) an area career and technical education school providing education at the postsecondary level;

“(E) a postsecondary educational institution controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or operated by or on behalf of any Indian tribe that is eligible to contract with the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of programs under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) or the Act of April 16, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 452 et seq.); or

“(F) an educational service agency.”;

(11) by adding after paragraph (20) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(21) ENGLISH LEARNER.—The term ‘English learner’ means—

“(A) a secondary school student who is an English learner, as defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801); or

“(B) an adult or an out-of-school youth who has limited ability in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language and—

“(i) whose native language is a language other than English; or

“(ii) who lives in a family environment in which a language other than English is the dominant language.

“(22) EVIDENCE-BASED.—The term ‘evidence-based’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101(21)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801(21)(A)).”;

(12) by inserting after paragraph (23) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(24) IN-DEMAND INDUSTRY SECTOR OR OCCUPATION.—The term ‘in-demand industry sector or occupation’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”;

(13) by inserting after paragraph (25) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(26) INDUSTRY OR SECTOR PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘industry or sector partnership’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”;

(14) by inserting after paragraph (28) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(29) LOCAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD.—The term ‘local workforce development board’ means a local workforce development board established under section 107 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.”;

(15) by inserting after paragraph (30) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(31) OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH.—The term ‘out-of-school youth’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”;

(16) by inserting after paragraph (32) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(33) PARAPROFESSIONAL.—The term ‘paraprofessional’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(34) PAY FOR SUCCESS INITIATIVE.—The term ‘pay for success initiative’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801), except that such term does not include an initiative that—

“(A) reduces the special education or related services that a student would otherwise receive under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.); or

“(B) otherwise reduces the rights of a student or the obligations of an entity under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), or any other law.”;

(17) by inserting after paragraph (35) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(36) PROGRAM OF STUDY.—The term ‘program of study’ means a coordinated, nonduplicative sequence of secondary and postsecondary academic and technical content that—

“(A) incorporates challenging State academic standards, including those adopted by a State under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)), that—

“(i) address both academic and technical knowledge and skills, including employability skills; and

“(ii) are aligned with the needs of industries in the economy of the State, region, or local area;

“(B) progresses in specificity (beginning with all aspects of an industry or career cluster and leading to more occupational specific instruction);

“(C) has multiple entry and exit points that incorporate credentialing; and

“(D) culminates in the attainment of a recognized postsecondary credential.

“(37) **QUALIFIED INTERMEDIARY.**—The term ‘qualified intermediary’ means a non-profit entity that demonstrates expertise to build, connect, sustain, and measure partnerships with entities such as employers, schools, community-based organizations, postsecondary institutions, social service organizations, economic development organizations, and workforce systems to broker services, resources, and supports to youth and the organizations and systems that are designed to serve youth, including—

“(A) connecting employers to classrooms;

“(B) assisting in the design and implementation of career and technical education programs and programs of study;

“(C) delivering professional development;

“(D) connecting students to internships and other work-based learning opportunities; and

“(E) developing personalized student supports.

“(38) **RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL.**—The term ‘recognized postsecondary credential’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).”;

(18) in paragraph (41) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2))—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “foster children” and inserting “youth who are in or have aged out of the foster care system”;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (F), by striking “individuals with limited English proficiency.” and inserting “English learners.”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) homeless individuals described in section 725 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11434a); and

“(H) youth with a parent who—

“(i) is a member of the armed forces (as such term is defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code); and

“(ii) is on active duty (as such term is defined in section 101(d)(1) of such title).”;

(19) by inserting after paragraph (41) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(42) **SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL.**—The term ‘specialized instructional support personnel’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(43) **SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES.**—The term ‘specialized instructional support services’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).”;

(20) in paragraph (45) (as so redesignated by paragraph (2)) by inserting “(including para-professionals and specialized instructional support personnel)” after “supportive personnel”; and

(21) by adding at the end the following:

“(48) **UNIVERSAL DESIGN FOR LEARNING.**—The term ‘universal design for learning’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(49) **WORK-BASED LEARNING.**—The term ‘work-based learning’ means sustained interactions with industry or community professionals in real workplace settings, to the extent practicable, or simulated environments at an educational institution that foster in-depth, first-hand engagement with the tasks required of a given career field, that are aligned to curriculum and instruction.”.

SEC. 8. TRANSITION PROVISIONS.

Section 4 (20 U.S.C. 2303) is amended—

(1) by striking “the Secretary determines to be appropriate” and inserting “are necessary”;

(2) by striking “Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006” each place it appears and inserting “Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act”; and

(3) by striking “1998” and inserting “2006”.

SEC. 9. PROHIBITIONS.

Section 8 (20 U.S.C. 2306a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Federal Government to mandate,” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “Federal Government—

“(1) to condition or incentivize the receipt of any grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, or the receipt of any priority or preference under such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement, upon a State, local educational agency, eligible agency, eligible recipient, eligible entity, or school’s adoption or implementation of specific instructional content, academic standards and assessments, curricula, or program of instruction (including any condition, priority, or preference to adopt the Common Core State Standards developed under the Common Core State Standards Initiative, any other academic standards common to a significant number of States, or any assessment, instructional content, or curriculum aligned to such standards);

“(2) through grants, contracts, or other cooperative agreements, to mandate, direct, or control a State, local educational agency, eligible agency, eligible recipient, eligible entity, or school’s specific instructional content, academic standards and assessments, curricula, or program of instruction (including any requirement, direction, or mandate to adopt the Common Core State Standards developed under the Common Core State Standards Initiative, any other academic standards common to a significant number of States, or any assessment, instructional content, or curriculum aligned to such standards); and

“(3) except as required under sections 112(b), 211(b), and 223—

“(A) to mandate, direct, or control the allocation of State or local resources; or

“(B) to mandate that a State or a political subdivision of a State spend any funds or incur any costs not paid for under this Act.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (d) and redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (d).

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 9 (20 U.S.C. 2307) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are to be authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act (other than sections 114 and 117)—

“(1) \$1,133,002,074 for fiscal year 2018;

“(2) \$1,148,618,465 for fiscal year 2019;

“(3) \$1,164,450,099 for fiscal year 2020;

“(4) \$1,180,499,945 for fiscal year 2021;

“(5) \$1,196,771,008 for fiscal year 2022; and

“(6) \$1,213,266,339 for fiscal year 2023.”.

TITLE I—CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION

SEC. 110. RESERVATIONS AND STATE ALLOTMENT.

Paragraph (5) of section 111(a) (20 U.S.C. 2321(a)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “No State” and inserting “For each of fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020, no State”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A), as amended by paragraph (1), the following:

“(B) **FISCAL YEAR 2021 AND EACH SUCCEEDING FISCAL YEAR.**—For fiscal year 2021 and each of the succeeding fiscal years, no State shall receive an allotment under this section for a fiscal year that is less than 90 percent of the allotment

the State received under this section for the preceding fiscal year.”; and

(4) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “subparagraph (A) or (B)”.

SEC. 111. WITHIN STATE ALLOCATION.

Section 112 (20 U.S.C. 2322) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “10 percent” and inserting “15 percent”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “1 percent” and inserting “2 percent”; and

(II) by striking “State correctional institutions and institutions” and inserting “State correctional institutions, juvenile justice facilities, and educational institutions”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “available for services” and inserting “available to assist eligible recipients in providing services”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “a local plan,” and inserting “local applications.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “section 135” and all that follows through the end and inserting “section 135—

“(1) in—

“(A) rural areas;

“(B) areas with high percentages of CTE concentrators or CTE participants; and

“(C) areas with high numbers of CTE concentrators or CTE participants; and

“(2) in order to—

“(A) foster innovation through the identification and promotion of promising and proven career and technical education programs, practices, and strategies, which may include practices and strategies that prepare individuals for nontraditional fields; or

“(B) promote the development, implementation, and adoption of programs of study or career pathways aligned with State-identified in-demand occupations or industries.”.

SEC. 112. ACCOUNTABILITY.

Section 113 (20 U.S.C. 2323) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “comprised of the activities” and inserting “comprising the activities”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraph (B) and redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), as so redesignated, by striking “, and State levels of performance described in paragraph (3)(B) for each additional indicator of performance”; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.**—

“(A) **CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE FOR CTE CONCENTRATORS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL.**—Each eligible agency shall identify in the State plan core indicators of performance for CTE concentrators at the secondary level that are valid and reliable, and that include, at a minimum, measures of each of the following:

“(i) The percentage of CTE concentrators who graduate high school, as measured by—

“(I) the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)); and

“(II) at the State’s discretion, the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate defined in such section 8101 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(ii) CTE concentrator attainment of challenging State academic standards adopted by the State under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)), and measured by the academic assessments described in section 1111(b)(2) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2)).

“(iii) The percentage of CTE concentrators who, in the second quarter following the program year after exiting from secondary education, are in postsecondary education or advanced training, military service, or unsubsidized employment.

“(iv) Not less than one indicator of career and technical education program quality that—

“(I) shall include, not less than one of the following—

“(aa) the percentage of CTE concentrators, as defined in section 3(11)(A)(ii), graduating from high school having attained recognized postsecondary credentials;

“(bb) the percentage of CTE concentrators, as defined in section 3(11)(A)(ii), graduating from high school having attained postsecondary credits in the relevant career and technical educational program or program of study earned through dual and concurrent enrollment or another credit transfer agreement; or

“(cc) the percentage of CTE concentrators, as defined in section 3(11)(A)(ii), graduating from high school having participated in work-based learning; and

“(II) may include any other measure of student success in career and technical education that is statewide, valid, and reliable.

“(v) The percentage of CTE concentrators, as defined in section 3(11)(A)(ii), in career and technical education programs and programs of study that lead to nontraditional fields.

“(B) CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE FOR CTE CONCENTRATORS AT THE POSTSECONDARY LEVEL.—Each eligible agency shall identify in the State plan core indicators of performance for CTE concentrators at the postsecondary level that are valid and reliable, and that include, at a minimum, measures of each of the following:

“(i) The percentage of CTE concentrators, who, during the second quarter after program completion, are in education or training activities, advanced training, or unsubsidized employment.

“(ii) The median earnings of CTE concentrators in unsubsidized employment two quarters after program completion.

“(iii) The percentage of CTE concentrators who receive a recognized postsecondary credential during participation in or within 1 year of program completion.

“(iv) The percentage of CTE concentrators in career and technical education programs and programs of study that lead to nontraditional fields.

“(C) ALIGNMENT OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.—In developing core indicators of performance under subparagraphs (A) and (B), an eligible agency shall, to the greatest extent possible, align the indicators so that substantially similar information gathered for other State and Federal programs, or for any other purpose, may be used to meet the requirements of this section.”;

(D) in paragraph (3)—
(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) STATE ADJUSTED LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE FOR CORE INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible agency, with input from eligible recipients, shall establish and identify in the State plan submitted under section 122, for the first 2 program years covered by the State plan, State levels of performance for each of the core indicators of performance described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) for career and technical education activities authorized under this title. The levels of performance established under this subparagraph shall, at a minimum—

“(I) be expressed in a percentage or numerical form, so as to be objective, quantifiable, and measurable; and

“(II) be sufficiently ambitious to allow for meaningful evaluation of program quality.

“(ii) STATE ADJUSTED LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE FOR SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Prior to the third program year covered by the State plan, each eligible agency shall revise the State levels of performance for each of the core indicators of performance for the subsequent program years covered by the State plan, taking into account the extent to which such levels of performance promote meaningful program improvement on such indicators. The State adjusted levels of

performance identified under this clause shall be considered to be the State adjusted levels of performance for the State for such years and shall be incorporated into the State plan.

“(iii) REPORTING.—The eligible agency shall, for each year described in clauses (i) and (iii), publicly report and widely disseminate the State levels of performance described in this subparagraph.

“(iv) REVISIONS.—If unanticipated circumstances arise in a State, the eligible agency may revise the State adjusted levels of performance required under this subparagraph, and submit such revised levels of performance with evidence supporting the revision and demonstrating public consultation, in a manner consistent with the procedure described in subsections (d) and (f) of section 122.”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) ACTUAL LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE.—At the end of each program year, the eligible agency shall determine actual levels of performance on each of the core indicators of performance and publicly report and widely disseminate the actual levels of performance described in this subparagraph.”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) ESTABLISHMENT OF LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE.—An eligible agency shall establish State levels of performance under subparagraph (A) in a manner consistent with the procedure adopted by the eligible agency under section 122(d)(9).”;

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i)(I), by striking “consistent with the State levels of performance established under paragraph (3), so as” and inserting “consistent with the form expressed in the State levels, so as”;

(II) by striking clause (i)(II) and inserting the following:

“(II) be sufficiently ambitious to allow for meaningful evaluation of program quality.”;

(III) in clause (iv)—

(aa) by striking “third and fifth program years” and inserting “third program year”; and
(bb) by striking “corresponding” before “subsequent program years”;

(IV) in clause (v)—

(aa) by striking “and” at the end of subclause (I);

(bb) by redesignating subclause (II) as subclause (III);

(cc) by inserting after subclause (I) the following:

“(II) local economic conditions.”;

(dd) in subclause (III), as so redesignated, by striking “promote continuous improvement on the core indicators of performance by the eligible recipient,” and inserting “advance the eligible recipient’s accomplishments of the goals set forth in the local application; and”; and
(ee) by adding at the end the following:

“(IV) the eligible recipient’s ability and capacity to collect and access valid, reliable, and cost effective data.”;

(V) in clause (vi), by inserting “or changes occur related to improvements in data or measurement approaches,” after “factors described in clause (v).”; and

(VI) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) REPORTING.—The eligible recipient shall, for each year described in clauses (iii) and (iv), publicly report the local levels of performance described in this subparagraph.”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in clause (ii)(I) of subparagraph (B), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i)” and inserting “section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii)”;

(II) by striking “section 3(29)” and inserting “section 3(40)”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the heading, by inserting “STATE” before “REPORT”;

(B) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “information on the levels of performance achieved by the State with respect to the additional indicators of performance, including the” and inserting “the”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) by striking “categories” and inserting “subgroups”;

(ii) by striking “section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i)” and inserting “section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii)”;

(iii) by striking “section 3(29)” and inserting “section 3(40)”.

SEC. 113. NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

Section 114 (20 U.S.C. 2324) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary shall” the first place it appears and inserting “The Secretary shall, in consultation with the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences.”;

(ii) by inserting “from eligible agencies under section 113(c)” after “pursuant to this title”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3);

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) REASONABLE COST.—The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to secure at reasonable cost the information required by this title. To ensure reasonable cost, the Secretary, in consultation with the National Center for Education Statistics and the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education shall determine the methodology to be used and the frequency with which such information is to be collected.”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”;

(ii) by striking “, directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements,” and inserting “directly or through grants”;

(iii) by striking “and assessment”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, acting through the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences,” after “describe how the Secretary”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “, in consultation with the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences,” after “the Secretary”;

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “, acting through the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences,” after “The Secretary”;

(II) by inserting “and the plan developed under subsection (c)” after “described in paragraph (2)”; and

(III) by striking “assessment” each place such term appears and inserting “evaluation”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (v), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(II) in clause (vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, which may include individuals with expertise in addressing inequities in access to, and in opportunities for academic and technical skill attainment; and”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) representatives of special populations.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “AND ASSESSMENT”;

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting “, acting through the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences,” after “the Secretary”;

(II) by striking “an independent evaluation and assessment” and inserting “a series of research and evaluation initiatives for each year for which funds are appropriated to carry out this Act, which are aligned with the plan in subsection (c)(2).”;

(III) by striking “Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006”

and inserting “Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act”;

(IV) by striking “, contracts, and cooperative agreements that are” and inserting “to institutions of higher education or a consortia of one or more institutions of higher education and one or more private nonprofit organizations or agencies”; and

(V) by adding at the end the following: “Such evaluation shall, whenever possible, use the most recent data available.”; and

(iii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) CONTENTS.—The evaluation required under subparagraph (A) shall include descriptions and evaluations of—

“(i) the extent and success of the integration of challenging State academic standards adopted under 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)) and career and technical education for students participating in career and technical education programs, including a review of the effect of such integration on the academic and technical proficiency achievement of such students (including the number of such students that receive a regular high school diploma, as such term is defined under section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 or a State-defined alternative diploma described in section 8101(25)(A)(ii)(I)(bb) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7801(25)(A)(ii)(I)(bb)));

“(ii) the extent to which career and technical education programs and programs of study prepare students, including special populations, for subsequent employment in high-skill, high-wage occupations (including those in which mathematics and science, which may include computer science, skills are critical), or for participation in postsecondary education;

“(iii) employer involvement in, benefit from, and satisfaction with, career and technical education programs and programs of study and career and technical education students’ preparation for employment;

“(iv) efforts to expand access to career and technical education programs of study for all students;

“(v) innovative approaches to work-based learning programs that increase participation and alignment with employment in high-growth industries, including in rural and low-income areas;

“(vi) the extent to which career and technical education programs supported by this Act are grounded on evidence-based research;

“(vii) the impact of the amendments to this Act made under the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, including comparisons, where appropriate, of—

“(I) the use of the comprehensive needs assessment under section 134(b);

“(II) the implementation of programs of study; and

“(III) coordination of planning and program delivery with other relevant laws, including the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.);

“(viii) changes in career and technical education program accountability as described in section 113 and any effects of such changes on program delivery and program quality; and

“(ix) changes in student enrollment patterns.”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) by inserting “, in consultation with the Director of the Institute for Education Sciences,” after “The Secretary”;;

(bb) in subclause (I)—

(AA) by striking “assessment” and inserting “evaluation and summary of research activities carried out under this section”; and

(BB) by striking “2010” and inserting “2021”; and

(cc) in subclause (II)—

(AA) by striking “assessment” and inserting “evaluation and summary of research activities carried out under this section”; and

(BB) by striking “2011” and inserting “2023”; and

(II) by adding after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) DISSEMINATION.—In addition to submitting the reports required under clause (i), the Secretary shall disseminate the results of the evaluation widely and on a timely basis in order to increase the understanding among State and local officials and educators of the effectiveness of programs and activities supported under the Act and of the career and technical education programs that are most likely to produce positive educational and employment outcomes.”; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) and inserting the following:

“(3) INNOVATION.—

“(A) GRANT PROGRAM.—To identify and support evidence-based and innovative strategies and activities to improve career and technical education and align workforce skills with labor market needs as part of the plan developed under subsection (c) and the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary may award grants to eligible entities to—

“(i) create, develop, implement, or take to scale evidence-based, field initiated innovations, including through a pay for success initiative, to improve student outcomes in career and technical education; and

“(ii) rigorously evaluate such innovations.

“(B) MATCHING FUNDS.—

“(i) MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED.—Except as provided under clause (ii), to receive a grant under this paragraph, an eligible entity shall, through cash or in-kind contributions, provide matching funds from public or private sources in an amount equal to at least 50 percent of the funds provided under such grant.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may waive the matching fund requirement under clause (i) if the eligible entity demonstrates exceptional circumstances.

“(C) APPLICATION.—To receive a grant under this paragraph, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary at such a time as the Secretary may require, an application that—

“(i) identifies and designates the agency, institution, or school responsible for the administration and supervision of the program assisted under this paragraph;

“(ii) identifies the source and amount of the matching funds required under subparagraph (B)(i);

“(iii) describes how the eligible entity will use the grant funds, including how such funds will directly benefit students, including special populations, served by the eligible entity;

“(iv) describes how the program assisted under this paragraph will be coordinated with the activities carried out under section 124 or 135;

“(v) describes how the program assisted under this paragraph aligns with the single plan described in subsection (c); and

“(vi) describes how the program assisted under this paragraph will be evaluated and how that evaluation may inform the report described in subsection (d)(2)(C).

“(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this paragraph, the Secretary shall give priority to applications from eligible entities that will predominantly serve students from low-income families.

“(E) GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In awarding grants under this paragraph, the Secretary shall award no less than 25 percent of the total available funds for any fiscal year to eligible entities proposing to fund career and technical education activities that serve—

“(I) a local educational agency with an urban-centric district locale code of 32, 33, 41, 42, or 43, as determined by the Secretary;

“(II) an institution of higher education primarily serving the one or more areas served by such a local educational agency;

“(III) a consortium of such local educational agencies or such institutions of higher education;

“(IV) a partnership between—

“(aa) an educational service agency or a nonprofit organization; and

“(bb) such a local educational agency or such an institution of higher education; or

“(V) a partnership between—

“(aa) a grant recipient described in subclause (I) or (II); and

“(bb) a State educational agency.

“(ii) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding clause (i), the Secretary shall reduce the amount of funds made available under such clause if the Secretary does not receive a sufficient number of applications of sufficient quality.

“(F) USES OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that is awarded a grant under this paragraph shall use the grant funds, in a manner consistent with subparagraph (A)(i), to—

“(i) improve career and technical education outcomes of students served by eligible entities under this title;

“(ii) improve career and technical education teacher effectiveness;

“(iii) improve the transition of students from secondary education to postsecondary education or employment;

“(iv) improve the incorporation of comprehensive work-based learning into career and technical education;

“(v) increase the effective use of technology within career and technical education programs;

“(vi) support new models for integrating academic content and career and technical education content in such programs;

“(vii) support the development and enhancement of innovative delivery models for career and technical education;

“(viii) work with industry to design and implement courses or programs of study aligned to labor market needs in new or emerging fields;

“(ix) integrate science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, including computer science education, with career and technical education;

“(x) support innovative approaches to career and technical education by redesigning the high school experience for students, which may include evidence-based transitional support strategies for students who have not met postsecondary education eligibility requirements;

“(xi) improve CTE concentrator employment outcomes in nontraditional fields; or

“(xii) support the use of career and technical education programs and programs of study in a coordinated strategy to address identified employer needs and workforce shortages, such as shortages in the early childhood, elementary school, and secondary school education workforce.

“(G) EVALUATION.—Each eligible entity receiving a grant under this paragraph shall provide for an independent evaluation of the activities carried out using such grant and submit to the Secretary an annual report that includes—

“(i) a description of how funds received under this paragraph were used;

“(ii) the performance of the eligible entity with respect to, at a minimum, the performance indicators described under section 113, as applicable, and disaggregated by—

“(I) subgroups of students described in section 1111(c)(2)(B) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(c)(2)(B));

“(II) special populations; and

“(III) as appropriate, each career and technical education program and program of study; and

“(iii) a quantitative analysis of the effectiveness of the project carried out under this paragraph.”; and

(5) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

- “(1) \$7,523,285 for fiscal year 2018;
- “(2) \$7,626,980 for fiscal year 2019;
- “(3) \$7,732,104 for fiscal year 2020;
- “(4) \$7,838,677 for fiscal year 2021;
- “(5) \$7,946,719 for fiscal year 2022; and
- “(6) \$8,056,251 for fiscal year 2023.”.

SEC. 114. ASSISTANCE FOR THE OUTLYING AREAS.

Section 115 (20 U.S.C. 2325) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “subject to subsection (d)” and inserting “subject to subsection (b)”;

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b).

SEC. 115. TRIBALLY CONTROLLED POSTSECONDARY CAREER AND TECHNICAL INSTITUTIONS.

Section 117(i) (20 U.S.C. 2327(i)) is amended to read as follows:

“(i) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

- “(1) \$8,400,208 for fiscal year 2018;
- “(2) \$8,515,989 for fiscal year 2019;
- “(3) \$8,633,367 for fiscal year 2020;
- “(4) \$8,752,362 for fiscal year 2021;
- “(5) \$8,872,998 for fiscal year 2022; and
- “(6) \$8,995,296 for fiscal year 2023.”.

SEC. 116. OCCUPATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION.

Section 118 (20 U.S.C. 2328) is repealed.

PART B—STATE PROVISIONS

SEC. 121. STATE PLAN.

Section 122 (20 U.S.C. 2342) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “6-year period” and inserting “4-year period”;

(ii) by striking “Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006” and inserting “Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “6-year period” and inserting “4-year period”;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “(including charter school)” and all that follows through “(and community organizations)” and inserting “(including teachers, faculty, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, school leaders, authorized public chartering agencies, and charter school leaders, consistent with State law, employers, labor organizations, parents, students, and community organizations)”;

(2) by amending subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) to read as follows:

“(b) **OPTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF STATE PLAN.**—

“(1) **COMBINED PLAN.**—The eligible agency may submit a combined plan that meets the requirements of this section and the requirements of section 103 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3113), unless the eligible agency opts to submit a single plan under paragraph (2) and informs the Secretary of such decision.

“(2) **SINGLE PLAN.**—If the eligible agency elects not to submit a combined plan as described in paragraph (1), such eligible agency shall submit a single State plan.

“(c) **PLAN DEVELOPMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The eligible agency shall—

“(A) develop the State plan in consultation with—

“(i) representatives of secondary and postsecondary career and technical education programs, including eligible recipients and representatives of 2-year Minority-Serving Institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities in States where such institutions are in existence, and charter school representatives in States where such schools are in existence, which shall include teachers, faculty, school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel (including guidance counselors), and paraprofessionals;

“(ii) interested community representatives, including parents and students;

“(iii) the State workforce development board described in section 101 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3111);

“(iv) representatives of special populations;

“(v) representatives of business and industry (including representatives of small business), which shall include representatives of industry and sector partnerships in the State, as appropriate, and representatives of labor organizations in the State;

“(vi) representatives of agencies serving out-of-school youth, homeless children and youth, and at-risk youth; and

“(vii) representatives of Indian tribes located in the State; and

“(B) consult the Governor of the State, and the heads of other State agencies with authority for career and technical education programs that are not the eligible agency, with respect to the development of the State plan.

“(2) **ACTIVITIES AND PROCEDURES.**—The eligible agency shall develop effective activities and procedures, including access to information needed to use such procedures, to allow the individuals and entities described in paragraph (1) to participate in State and local decisions that relate to development of the State plan.

“(d) **PLAN CONTENTS.**—The State plan shall include—

“(1) a summary of State-supported workforce development activities (including education and training) in the State, including the degree to which the State’s career and technical education programs and programs of study are aligned with such activities;

“(2) the State’s strategic vision and set of goals for preparing an educated and skilled workforce (including special populations) and for meeting the skilled workforce needs of employers, including in-demand industry sectors and occupations as identified by the State, and how the State’s career and technical education programs will help to meet these goals;

“(3) a summary of the strategic planning elements of the unified State plan required under section 102(b)(1) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3112(b)(1)), including the elements related to system alignment under section 102(b)(2)(B) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3112(b)(2)(B));

“(4) a description of the career and technical education programs or programs of study that will be supported, developed, or improved, including descriptions of—

“(A) the programs of study to be developed at the State level and made available for adoption by eligible recipients;

“(B) the process and criteria to be used for approving locally developed programs of study or career pathways, including how such programs address State workforce development and education needs; and

“(C) how the eligible agency will—

“(i) make information on approved programs of study and career pathways, including career exploration, work-based learning opportunities, dual and concurrent enrollment opportunities, and guidance and advisement resources, available to students and parents;

“(ii) ensure nonduplication of eligible recipients’ development of programs of study and career pathways;

“(iii) determine alignment of eligible recipients’ programs of study to the State, regional or local economy, including in-demand fields and occupations identified by the State workforce development board as appropriate;

“(iv) provide equal access to activities assisted under this Act for special populations;

“(v) coordinate with the State workforce board to support the local development of career pathways and articulate processes by which career pathways will be developed by local workforce development boards;

“(vi) use State, regional, or local labor market data to align career and technical education with State labor market needs;

“(vii) support effective and meaningful collaboration between secondary schools, postsecondary institutions, and employers, which may include the development of articulation agreements described in section 124(b)(3); and

“(viii) improve outcomes for CTE concentrators, including those who are members of special populations;

“(5) a description of the criteria and process for how the eligible agency will approve eligible recipients for funds under this Act, including how—

“(A) each eligible recipient will promote academic achievement;

“(B) each eligible recipient will promote skill attainment, including skill attainment that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential; and

“(C) each eligible recipient will ensure the local needs assessment under section 134 takes into consideration local economic and education needs, including where appropriate, in-demand industry sectors and occupations;

“(6) a description of how the eligible agency will support the recruitment and preparation of teachers, including special education teachers, faculty, administrators, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals to provide career and technical education instruction, leadership, and support;

“(7) a description of how the eligible agency will use State leadership funding to meet the requirements of section 124(b);

“(8) a description of how funds received by the eligible agency through the allotment made under section 111 will be distributed—

“(A) among career and technical education at the secondary level, or career and technical education at the postsecondary and adult level, or both, including how such distribution will most effectively provide students with the skills needed to succeed in the workplace; and

“(B) among any consortia that may be formed among secondary schools and eligible institutions, and how funds will be distributed among the members of the consortia, including the rationale for such distribution and how it will most effectively provide students with the skills needed to succeed in the workplace;

“(9) a description of the procedure the eligible agency will adopt for determining State adjusted levels of performance described in section 113, which at a minimum shall include—

“(A) consultation with stakeholders identified in paragraph (1);

“(B) opportunities for the public to comment in person and in writing on the State adjusted levels of performance included in the State plan; and

“(C) submission of public comment on State adjusted levels of performance as part of the State plan; and

“(10) assurances that—

“(A) the eligible agency will comply with the requirements of this Act and the provisions of the State plan, including the provision of a financial audit of funds received under this Act, which may be included as part of an audit of other Federal or State programs;

“(B) none of the funds expended under this Act will be used to acquire equipment (including computer software) in any instance in which such acquisition results in a direct financial benefit to any organization representing the interests of the acquiring entity or the employees of the acquiring entity, or any affiliate of such an organization;

“(C) the eligible agency will use the funds to promote preparation for high-skill, high-wage, or in-demand occupations and nontraditional fields, as identified by the State;

“(D) the eligible agency will use the funds provided under this Act to implement career and technical education programs and programs of study for individuals in State correctional institutions, including juvenile justice facilities; and

“(E) the eligible agency will provide local educational agencies, area career and technical

education schools, and eligible institutions in the State with technical assistance, including technical assistance on how to close gaps in student participation and performance in career and technical education programs.

“(e) CONSULTATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The eligible agency shall develop the portion of each State plan relating to the amount and uses of any funds proposed to be reserved for adult career and technical education, postsecondary career and technical education, and secondary career and technical education after consultation with the—

“(A) State agency responsible for supervision of community colleges, technical institutes, or other 2-year postsecondary institutions primarily engaged in providing postsecondary career and technical education;

“(B) the State agency responsible for secondary education; and

“(C) the State agency responsible for adult education.

“(2) OBJECTIONS OF STATE AGENCIES.—If a State agency other than the eligible agency finds that a portion of the final State plan is objectionable, that objection shall be filed together with the State plan. The eligible agency shall respond to any objections of such State agency in the State plan submitted to the Secretary.

“(f) PLAN APPROVAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve a State plan not later than 120 days after its submission to the Secretary unless the Secretary—

“(A) determines that the State plan does not meet the requirements of this Act, including the requirements described in section 113; and

“(B) meets the requirements of paragraph (2) with respect to such plan.

“(2) DISAPPROVAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) have the authority to disapprove a State plan only if the Secretary—

“(i) determines how the State plan fails to meet the requirements of this Act; and

“(ii) provides to the eligible agency, in writing, notice of such determination and the supporting information and rationale to substantiate such determination; and

“(B) not finally disapprove a State plan, except after making the determination and providing the information described in subparagraph (A), and giving the eligible agency notice and an opportunity for a hearing.”

SEC. 122. IMPROVEMENT PLANS.

Section 123 (20 U.S.C. 2343) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “percent of an agreed upon” and inserting “percent of the”; and

(ii) by striking “appropriate agencies,” and inserting “appropriate State agencies.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “purposes of this Act,” and inserting “purposes of this section, including after implementation of the improvement plan described in paragraph (1),” and

(ii) by striking “work with the eligible agency” and inserting “provide the eligible agency technical assistance”; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the eligible agency fails to make any improvement in meeting any of the State adjusted levels of performance for any of the core indicators of performance identified under paragraph (1) during the first 2 years of implementation of the improvement plan required under paragraph (1), the eligible agency—

“(i) shall develop and implement, in consultation with the stakeholders described in section 122(c)(1)(A), a revised improvement plan (with special consideration of performance gaps identified under section 113(c)(2)(B)) to address the reasons for such failure; and

“(ii) shall continue to implement such improvement plan until the eligible agency meets

at least 90 percent of the State adjusted level of performance for the same core indicators of performance for which the plan is revised.”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A), the following:

“(B) REVISED PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance, monitoring, and oversight to each eligible agency with a plan revised under subparagraph (A)(i) until such agency meets the requirements of subparagraph (A)(ii).”; and

(iv) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking “sanction in” and inserting “requirements of”; and

(D) by striking paragraph (4);

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “the eligible agency, appropriate agencies, individuals, and organizations” and inserting “local stakeholders included in section 134(d)(1)”;;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “shall work with the eligible recipient to implement improvement activities consistent with the requirements of this Act.” and inserting “shall provide technical assistance to assist the eligible recipient in meeting its responsibilities under section 134.”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the eligible recipient fails to make any improvement in meeting any of the local adjusted levels of performance for any of the core indicators of performance identified under paragraph (2) during a number of years determined by the eligible agency, the eligible recipient—

“(i) shall revise the improvement plan described in paragraph (2) to address the reasons for such failure; and

“(ii) shall continue to implement such improvement plan until such recipient meets at least 90 percent of an agreed upon local adjusted level of performance for the same core indicators of performance for which the plan is revised.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(aa) by striking “In determining whether to impose sanctions under subparagraph (A), the” and inserting “The”; and

(bb) by striking “waive imposing sanctions” and inserting “waive the requirements of subparagraph (A)”;;

(II) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end; (III) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) in response to a public request from an eligible recipient consistent with clauses (i) and (ii).”; and

(D) by striking paragraph (5); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) PLAN DEVELOPMENT.—Except for consultation described in subsection (b)(2), the State and local improvement plans, and the elements of such plans, required under this section shall be developed solely by the eligible agency or the eligible recipient, respectively.”

SEC. 123. STATE LEADERSHIP ACTIVITIES.

Section 124 (20 U.S.C. 2344) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “shall conduct State leadership activities.” and inserting “shall—

“(1) conduct State leadership activities directly; and

“(2) report on the effectiveness of such use of funds in achieving the goals described in section 122(d)(2) and the State adjusted levels of performance described in section 113(b)(3)(A).”;;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) through (4) and inserting the following:

“(1) developing statewide programs of study, which may include standards, curriculum, and

course development, and career exploration, guidance, and advisement activities and resources;

“(2) approving locally developed programs of study that meet the requirements established in section 122(d)(4)(B);

“(3) establishing statewide articulation agreements aligned to approved programs of study;

“(4) establishing statewide partnerships among local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and employers, including small businesses, to develop and implement programs of study aligned to State and local economic and education needs, including as appropriate, in-demand industry sectors and occupations.”; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (6) through (9) and inserting the following:

“(6) support services for individuals in State institutions, such as State correctional institutions, including juvenile justice facilities, and educational institutions that serve individuals with disabilities;

“(7) for faculty and teachers providing career and technical education instruction, support services, and specialized instructional support services, high-quality comprehensive professional development that is, to the extent practicable, grounded in evidence-based research (to the extent a State determines that such evidence is reasonably available) that identifies the most effective educator professional development process and is coordinated and aligned with other professional development activities carried out by the State (including under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.) and title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.)), including programming that—

“(A) promotes the integration of the challenging State academic standards adopted by the State under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)) and relevant technical knowledge and skills;

“(B) prepares career and technical education teachers, faculty, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals to provide appropriate accommodations for students who are members of special populations, including through the use of principles of universal design for learning; and

“(C) increases understanding of industry standards, as appropriate, for faculty providing career and technical education instruction; and

“(8) technical assistance for eligible recipients.”; and

(3) in subsection (c), by striking paragraphs (1) through (17) and inserting the following:

“(1) awarding incentive grants to eligible recipients—

“(A) for exemplary performance in carrying out programs under this Act, which awards shall be based on—

“(i) eligible recipients exceeding the local adjusted level of performance established under section 113(b)(4)(A) in a manner that reflects sustained or significant improvement;

“(ii) eligible recipients effectively developing connections between secondary education and postsecondary education and training;

“(iii) the integration of academic and technical standards;

“(iv) eligible recipients’ progress in closing achievement gaps among subpopulations who participate in programs of study; or

“(v) other factors relating to the performance of eligible recipients under this Act as the eligible agency determines are appropriate; or

“(B) if an eligible recipient elects to use funds as permitted under section 135(c);

“(2) providing support for the adoption and integration of recognized postsecondary credentials or for consultation and coordination with other State agencies for the identification, consolidation, or elimination of licenses or certifications which pose an unnecessary barrier to entry for aspiring workers and provide limited consumer protection;

“(3) the creation, implementation, and support of pay-for-success initiatives leading to recognized postsecondary credentials;

“(4) support for career and technical education programs for adults and out-of-school youth concurrent with their completion of their secondary school education in a school or other educational setting;

“(5) the creation, evaluation, and support of competency-based curricula;

“(6) support for the development, implementation, and expansion of programs of study or career pathways in areas declared to be in a state of emergency under section 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5191);

“(7) providing support for dual or concurrent enrollment programs, such as early college high schools;

“(8) improvement of career guidance and academic counseling programs that assist students in making informed academic and career and technical education decisions, including academic and financial aid counseling;

“(9) support for the integration of employability skills into career and technical education programs and programs of study;

“(10) support for programs and activities that increase access, student engagement, and success in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields (including computer science), particularly for students who are members of groups underrepresented in such subject fields, such as female students, minority students, and students who are members of special populations;

“(11) support for career and technical student organizations, especially with respect to efforts to increase the participation of students who are members of special populations;

“(12) support for establishing and expanding work-based learning opportunities;

“(13) support for preparing, retaining, and training of career and technical education teachers, faculty, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, such as preservice, professional development, and leadership development programs;

“(14) integrating and aligning programs of study and career pathways;

“(15) supporting the use of career and technical education programs and programs of study aligned with State, regional, or local in-demand industry sectors or occupations identified by State or local workforce development boards;

“(16) making all forms of instructional content widely available, which may include use of open educational resources;

“(17) support for the integration of arts and design skills, when appropriate, into career and technical education programs and programs of study; and

“(18) support for accelerated learning programs (described in section 4104(b)(3)(A)(i)(IV) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7114(b)(3)(A)(i)(IV)) when any such program is part of a program of study.”.

PART C—LOCAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 131. LOCAL APPLICATION FOR CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Section 134 (20 U.S.C. 2354) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking “LOCAL PLAN” and inserting “LOCAL APPLICATION”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “LOCAL PLAN” and inserting “LOCAL APPLICATION”;

(B) by striking “submit a local plan” and inserting “submit a local application”; and

(C) by striking “Such local plan” and inserting “Such local application”; and

(3) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) CONTENTS.—The eligible agency shall determine the requirements for local applications, except that each local application shall contain—

“(1) a description of the results of the comprehensive needs assessment conducted under subsection (c);

“(2) information on the programs of study approved by a State under section 124(b)(2) supported by the eligible recipient with funds under this part, including—

“(A) how the results of the comprehensive needs assessment described in subsection (c) informed the selection of the specific career and technical education programs and activities selected to be funded; and

“(B) a description of any new programs of study the eligible recipient will develop and submit to the State for approval;

“(3) a description of how the eligible recipient will provide—

“(A) career exploration and career development coursework, activities, or services;

“(B) career information; and

“(C) an organized system of career guidance and academic counseling to students before enrolling and while participating in a career and technical education program; and

“(4) a description of how the eligible recipient will—

“(A) provide activities to prepare special populations for high-skill, high-wage, or in-demand occupations that will lead to self-sufficiency; and

“(B) prepare CTE participants for nontraditional fields.

“(c) COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive financial assistance under this part, an eligible recipient shall—

“(A) conduct a comprehensive local needs assessment related to career and technical education; and

“(B) not less than once every 2 years, update such comprehensive local needs assessment.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The comprehensive local needs assessment described under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) an evaluation of the performance of the students served by the eligible recipient with respect to State and local adjusted levels of performance established pursuant to section 113, including an evaluation of performance for special populations;

“(B) a description of how career and technical education programs offered by the eligible recipient are—

“(i) sufficient in size, scope, and quality to meet the needs of all students served by the eligible recipient; and

“(ii) (I) aligned to State, regional, or local in-demand industry sectors or occupations identified by the State or local workforce development board, including career pathways, where appropriate; or

“(II) designed to meet local education or economic needs not identified by State or local workforce development boards;

“(C) an evaluation of progress toward the implementation of career and technical education programs and programs of study;

“(D) an evaluation of strategies needed to overcome barriers that result in lowering rates of access to, or lowering success in, career and technical education programs for special populations, which may include strategies to establish or utilize existing flexible learning and manufacturing facilities, such as makerspaces;

“(E) a description of how the eligible recipient will improve recruitment, retention, and training of career and technical education teachers, faculty, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, and career, academic, and guidance counselors, including individuals in groups underrepresented in such professions; and

“(F) a description of how the eligible recipient will support the transition to teaching from business and industry.

“(d) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the comprehensive needs assessment under subsection (c), an eligible recipient shall involve a diverse body of stakeholders, including, at a minimum—

“(1) representatives of career and technical education programs in a local educational agency or educational service agency, including teachers and administrators;

“(2) representatives of career and technical education programs at postsecondary educational institutions, including faculty and administrators;

“(3) representatives of State or local workforce development boards and a range of local or regional businesses or industries;

“(4) parents and students;

“(5) representatives of special populations; and

“(6) representatives of local agencies serving out-of-school youth, homeless children and youth, and at-risk youth (as defined in section 1432 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6472)).

“(e) CONTINUED CONSULTATION.—An eligible recipient receiving financial assistance under this part shall consult with the entities described in subsection (d) on an ongoing basis to—

“(1) provide input on annual updates to the comprehensive needs assessment required under subsection (c);

“(2) ensure programs of study are—

“(A) responsive to community employment needs;

“(B) aligned with employment priorities in the State, regional, or local economy identified by employers and the entities described in subsection (d), which may include in-demand industry sectors or occupations identified by the local workforce development board;

“(C) informed by labor market information, including information provided under section 15(e)(2)(C) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491–2(e)(2)(C));

“(D) designed to meet current, intermediate, or long-term labor market projections; and

“(E) allow employer input, including input from industry or sector partnerships in the local area, where applicable, into the development and implementation of programs of study to ensure programs align with skills required by local employment opportunities, including activities such as the identification of relevant standards, curriculum, industry-recognized credentials, and current technology and equipment;

“(3) identify and encourage opportunities for work-based learning; and

“(4) ensure funding under this part is used in a coordinated manner with other local resources.”.

SEC. 132. LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.

Section 135 (20 U.S.C. 2355) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 135. LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Each eligible recipient that receives funds under this part shall use such funds to develop, coordinate, implement, or improve career and technical education programs to meet the needs identified in the comprehensive needs assessment described in section 134(c).

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR USES OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to eligible recipients under this part shall be used to support career and technical education programs that are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to be effective and—

“(1) provide career exploration and career development activities through an organized, systematic framework designed to aid students, before enrolling and while participating in a career and technical education program, in making informed plans and decisions about future education and career opportunities and programs of study, which may include—

“(A) introductory courses or activities focused on career exploration and career awareness;

“(B) readily available career and labor market information, including information on—

“(i) occupational supply and demand;

“(ii) educational requirements;

“(iii) other information on careers aligned to State or local economic priorities; and

“(iv) employment sectors;

“(C) programs and activities related to the development of student graduation and career plans;

“(D) career guidance and academic counselors that provide information on postsecondary education and career options; or

“(E) any other activity that advances knowledge of career opportunities and assists students in making informed decisions about future education and employment goals;

“(2) provide professional development for teachers, principals, school leaders, administrators, faculty, and career and guidance counselors with respect to content and pedagogy that—

“(A) supports individualized academic and career and technical education instructional approaches, including the integration of academic and career and technical education standards and curriculum;

“(B) ensures labor market information is used to inform the programs, guidance, and advisement offered to students;

“(C) provides educators with opportunities to advance knowledge, skills, and understanding of all aspects of an industry, including the latest workplace equipment, technologies, standards, and credentials;

“(D) supports administrators in managing career and technical education programs in the schools, institutions, or local educational agencies of such administrators;

“(E) supports the implementation of strategies to improve student achievement and close gaps in student participation and performance in career and technical education programs; and

“(F) provides educators with opportunities to advance knowledge, skills, and understanding in pedagogical practices, including, to the extent the eligible recipient determines that such evidence is reasonably available, evidence-based pedagogical practices;

“(3) provide career and technical education students, including special populations, with the skills necessary to pursue high-skill, high-wage occupations;

“(4) support integration of academic skills into career and technical education programs and programs of study to support CTE participants at the secondary school level in meeting the challenging State academic standards adopted under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(1)) by the State in which the eligible recipient is located;

“(5) plan and carry out elements that support the implementation of career and technical education programs and programs of study and student achievement of the local adjusted levels of performance established under section 113, which may include—

“(A) curriculum aligned with the requirements for a program of study;

“(B) sustainable relationships among education, business and industry, and other community stakeholders, including industry or sector partnerships in the local area, where applicable, that are designed to facilitate the process of continuously updating and aligning programs of study with skills in demand in the State, regional, or local economy;

“(C) dual or concurrent enrollment programs, including early college high schools, and the development or implementation of articulation agreements;

“(D) appropriate equipment, technology, and instructional materials (including support for library resources) aligned with business and industry needs, including machinery, testing equipment, tools, implements, hardware and software, and other new and emerging instructional materials;

“(E) a continuum of work-based learning opportunities;

“(F) industry-recognized certification exams or other assessments leading toward industry-recognized postsecondary credentials;

“(G) efforts to recruit and retain career and technical education program administrators and educators;

“(H) where applicable, coordination with other education and workforce development programs and initiatives, including career pathways and sector partnerships developed under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) and other Federal laws and initiatives that provide students with transition-related services, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.);

“(I) expanding opportunities for students to participate in distance career and technical education and blended-learning programs;

“(J) expanding opportunities for students to participate in competency-based education programs;

“(K) improving career guidance and academic counseling programs that assist students in making informed academic and career and technical education decisions, including academic and financial aid counseling;

“(L) supporting the integration of employability skills into career and technical education programs and programs of study;

“(M) supporting programs and activities that increase access, student engagement, and success in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields (including computer science) for students who are members of groups underrepresented in such subject fields;

“(N) providing career and technical education, in a school or other educational setting, for adults or a school-aged individual who has dropped out of a secondary school to complete secondary school education or upgrade technical skills;

“(O) career and technical student organizations, including student preparation for and participation in technical skills competitions aligned with career and technical education program standards and curriculum;

“(P) making all forms of instructional content widely available, which may include use of open educational resources;

“(Q) supporting the integration of arts and design skills, when appropriate, into career and technical education programs and programs of study;

“(R) where appropriate, expanding opportunities for CTE concentrators to participate in accelerated learning programs (described in section 4104(b)(3)(A)(i)(IV) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7114(b)(3)(A)(i)(IV)) as part of a program of study; and

“(S) other activities to improve career and technical education programs; and

“(6) develop and implement evaluations of the activities carried out with funds under this part, including evaluations necessary to complete the comprehensive needs assessment required under section 134(c) and the local report required under section 113(b)(4)(C).

“(c) **POOLING FUNDS.**—An eligible recipient may pool a portion of funds received under this Act with a portion of funds received under this Act available to not less than one other eligible recipient to support implementation of programs of study through the activities described in subsection (b)(2).

“(d) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—Each eligible recipient receiving funds under this part shall not use more than 5 percent of such funds for costs associated with the administration of activities under this section.”

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. FEDERAL AND STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

The Act (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 311(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D), in order for a State

to receive its full allotment of funds under this Act for any fiscal year, the Secretary must find that the State’s fiscal effort per student, or the aggregate expenditures of such State, with respect to career and technical education for the preceding fiscal year was not less than the fiscal effort per student, or the aggregate expenditures of such State, for the second preceding fiscal year.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “shall exclude capital expenditures, special 1-time project costs, and the cost of pilot programs.” and inserting “shall, at the request of the State, exclude competitive or incentive-based programs established by the State, capital expenditures, special one-time project costs, and the cost of pilot programs.”; and

(iii) by adding after subparagraph (C), the following new subparagraph:

“(D) **ESTABLISHING THE STATE BASELINE.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the State may—

“(I) continue to use the State’s fiscal effort per student, or aggregate expenditures of such State, with respect to career and technical education, as was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act; or

“(II) establish a new level of fiscal effort per student, or aggregate expenditures of such State, with respect to career and technical education, which is not less than 90 percent of the State’s fiscal effort per student, or the aggregate expenditures of such State, with respect to career and technical education for the preceding fiscal year.

“(ii) **AMOUNT.**—The amount of the new level described in clause (i)(II) shall be the State’s fiscal effort per student, or aggregate expenditures of such State, with respect to career and technical education, for the first full fiscal year following the enactment of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **FAILURE TO MEET.**—The Secretary shall reduce the amount of a State’s allotment of funds under this Act for any fiscal year in the exact proportion by which the State fails to meet the requirement of paragraph (1) by falling below the State’s fiscal effort per student or the State’s aggregate expenditures (using the measure most favorable to the State), if the State failed to meet such requirement (as determined using the measure most favorable to the State) for 1 or more of the 5 immediately preceding fiscal years.

“(3) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary may waive paragraph (2) due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances affecting the ability of the State to meet the requirement of paragraph (1).”;

(2) in section 317(b)(1)—

(A) by striking “may, upon written request, use funds made available under this Act to” and inserting “may use funds made available under this Act to”; and

(B) by striking “who reside in the geographical area served by” and inserting “located in or near the geographical area served by”;

(3) by striking title II and redesignating title III as title II;

(4) by redesignating sections 311 through 318 as sections 211 through 218, respectively;

(5) by redesignating sections 321 through 324 as sections 221 through 224, respectively; and

(6) by inserting after section 218 (as so redesignated) the following:

“**SEC. 219. STUDY ON PROGRAMS OF STUDY ALIGNED TO HIGH-SKILL, HIGH-WAGE OCCUPATIONS.**

“(a) **SCOPE OF STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to evaluate—

“(1) the strategies, components, policies, and practices used by eligible agencies or eligible recipients receiving funding under this Act to successfully assist—

“(A) all students in pursuing and completing programs of study aligned to high-skill, high-wage occupations; and

“(B) any specific subgroup of students identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(h)(1)(C)(ii)) in pursuing and completing programs of study aligned to high-skill, high-wage occupations in fields in which such subgroup is underrepresented; and

“(2) any challenges associated with replication of such strategies, components, policies, and practices.

“(b) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out the study conducted under subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall consult with a geographically diverse (including urban, suburban, and rural) representation of—

“(1) students and parents;

“(2) eligible agencies and eligible recipients;

“(3) teachers, faculty, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, including those with expertise in preparing CTE students for nontraditional fields;

“(4) special populations; and

“(5) representatives of business and industry.

“(c) SUBMISSION.—Upon completion, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit the study conducted under subsection (a) to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.”

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGNER-PEYSEY ACT

SEC. 301. STATE RESPONSIBILITIES.

Section 15(e)(2) of the Wagner-Peyser Act (29 U.S.C. 491–2(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) consult with eligible agencies (defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302)), State educational agencies, and local educational agencies concerning the provision of workforce and labor market information in order to—

“(i) meet the needs of secondary school and postsecondary school students who seek such information; and

“(ii) annually inform the development and implementation of programs of study defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302), and career pathways;”;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph:

“(I) provide, on an annual and timely basis to each eligible agency (defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302)), the data and information described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (a)(1).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2353.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

Mr. Speaker, for years, Americans have urged Congress to work together and advance policies that promote good-paying jobs. We have heard the voices of those struggling to find the opportunities they need. They have been frustrated that the economy has taken so long to recover. Many feel stuck in a job market that has transformed dramatically due to advances in technology and an increasingly competitive global economy.

It is time to deliver the results hard-working men and women desperately need and restore rungs on the ladder of opportunity. That is exactly why we are here today.

This legislation is about jobs. I, along with my colleague Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY, introduced H.R. 2353 to help prepare more Americans to succeed in the workforce by improving career and technical education.

Today, far too many Americans lack the skills and education they need to build a promising career, and many jobs are going unfilled as employers face a shortage of skilled workers.

Paul Tomczuk, president of R. H. Marcon and a constituent of mine, said: “Workforce development is one of the most pressing challenges facing roofing contractors today.” This is a problem we cannot afford to ignore.

As co-chair of the Career and Technical Education Caucus, I have worked hard to address this challenge by enhancing awareness of how CTE programs can lift people out of poverty and expand opportunity.

Too often, it is suggested that, in order to be successful in life, you have to get a bachelor's degree, but that is not the reality of today's diverse economy. In fact, I have met people who have gone into debt from attending a 4-year college or university only to enroll in a CTE program after graduation to get that good-paying job.

Attending a more traditional college or university simply isn't the right fit for everyone. There are countless individuals who learn best in innovative, work-based programming where they can acquire hands-on experience aimed at a certain career.

CTE programs are preparing students for the jobs of the future, including in technology, engineering, healthcare, agriculture, and more. However, there is more that can be done to ensure these programs are successful.

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act will rein in the Federal Government's role in CTE and empower State and local leaders to tailor programs to meet the unique needs of the students in their communities. It will give students and parents the tools they need to hold programs accountable.

Most importantly, this legislation encourages local education leaders to collaborate with local employers and improves alignment with CTE programs and in-demand jobs. This legislation is a win for American workers.

By working together, we have developed a set of bipartisan reforms that will help address our Nation's skills gap, break the cycle of poverty, and help more individuals climb the ladder of opportunity.

I want to thank Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for all the work that went into moving H.R. 2353 forward, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2353. H.R. 2353 is a bill introduced by my good friend Congressman THOMPSON and myself to modernize and take career and technical education into the 21st century.

A persistent complaint I hear from employers throughout the State of Illinois is that CTE programs have not kept pace with the changing demands of industry. This bill would address the skills gap by aligning CTE programs to meet the needs of the labor market, giving stakeholders more autonomy in developing curricula, while ensuring robust accountability standards. I hope everybody will support passage of H.R. 2353.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the distinguished chairwoman of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, who has had a commitment to skills-based education for many years.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. THOMPSON, for his leadership on this issue. As he said, I have been a strong supporter of this for a long, long time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

Mr. Speaker, when many Americans think of higher education, they think of a traditional college or university on a sprawling green campus. They think of students leaving colleges and universities with their degree in hand, ready for a career and set for life.

While many Americans choose this path, there is a misconception that this is the only pathway to success. For many hardworking Americans, the pathway to success does not require a baccalaureate degree. In fact, skills-focused education has helped countless Americans gain the specialized knowledge and skills they need to enter the workforce and build fulfilling lives.

So many men and women have found success through workforce development programs, however, we have come

to a critical juncture with the future of these programs, and our educational institutions have not caught up. As a result, American businesses, large and small, are having a hard time finding enough workers with the skills and talent they need.

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which unanimously passed the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, provides critical reforms to our Nation's education programs and prepares students to compete in our competitive global economy.

Mr. Speaker, all education is truly career education, and we must give our students every opportunity to attain the skills they need to succeed. When students, parents, employers, and, yes, lawmakers understand that, we will be on the right track to closing the skills gap that exists in our country.

I want to thank my colleagues, especially Representative THOMPSON, for his leadership on this issue. As the co-chair of the CTE Caucus, he has spent years championing this issue.

I also want to thank Ranking Member SCOTT and Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY, as well as all committee members, for the bipartisan work that is reflected in this bill.

Expanding opportunity through CTE is vital to closing the Nation's skills gap, ending the cycle of poverty, and creating a better tomorrow for hard-working Americans.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 2353.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, someone who has dedicated his career, in part, to this issue.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership on this legislation.

I rise in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which will reauthorize the Perkins Career and Technical Education program. H.R. 2353 builds on the House's bipartisan efforts in the last Congress, when this Chamber passed CTE reauthorization by a vote of 405-5.

The research is clear: The United States workforce is suffering a skills gap. According to Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, by 2020, 65 percent of all jobs in the United States will require at least some postsecondary education or skills acquisition. Yet, if the current trend holds, by 2020, our Nation will have more than 5 million fewer skilled workers than necessary to fill the high-skilled jobs which will be available. In Virginia alone, that is 30,000 open jobs; 17,000 are in the area of cybersecurity, and those jobs have salaries starting at \$88,000.

This bipartisan, comprehensive reauthorization will improve program qual-

ity and services for students most in need of skills. It will also update the Federal investment in CTE to provide increased State and local flexibility, while ensuring greater accountability for program quality.

It ensures that there remains in place a Federal focus on equity of opportunity and the role of the U.S. Department of Education to protect and promote the civil rights of all students and compliance with Federal laws.

The bill also strengthens the Federal commitment to support delivery of high-quality CTE programs by retaining the Department of Education's full authority to approve or disapprove State and local plans.

The bill also requires Federal oversight, monitoring, and technical assistance to support program improvement and maintains full authority of the Secretary to enforce compliance with statutory program requirements and Federal civil rights laws.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for their bipartisan leadership, and the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for his leadership as the chair of the CTE Caucus and for his dedication to realizing a comprehensive program reauthorization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously reported by the committee. It has nearly unanimous support from business groups, educators, and community stakeholders, so I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), the subcommittee chairman for the Workforce Protections Subcommittee of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and I am proud to rise in support of this strong, bipartisan legislation.

Improving career and technical education programs is the most important thing Congress can do to help close the skills gap, combat poverty, and help put Americans back to work.

Studies clearly show that there are unfilled high-wage jobs out there that remain open because people lack the skills to fill the jobs. That is where CTE comes in.

When I was chancellor of Alabama's 2-year college system, I saw firsthand just how impressive these programs are. They really do work like magic by taking an untrained worker and giving him the skills he needs to fill an in-demand job. It is a win-win for everyone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor and supporter of this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this

reform-oriented bill that helps build the 21st century workforce.

□ 1400

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), the chair of the CTE Caucus.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Career and Technical Education Caucus, I rise in strong support of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. This bipartisan bill, Mr. Speaker, is long overdue. The Carl D. Perkins CTE Act, the primary Federal investment in CTE, has not been reauthorized in over a decade.

I want to thank my colleagues, particularly Chairwoman FOXX, Ranking Member SCOTT, Representative THOMPSON, and Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY for their leadership and collaboration on this important bill, and a particular thanks to my co-chair of the CTE Caucus, Mr. THOMPSON, for his outstanding leadership and partnership on this issue over the years.

Mr. Speaker, CTE provides students of all ages with the skills they need to succeed in high-demand, high-paying, high-skilled jobs. At a time right now when hundreds of thousands of jobs in manufacturing, IT, and other skilled trades remain unfilled, Congress has a responsibility to empower workers with appropriate education and training. If we fail to modernize and invest in CTE, we will be unable to build a skilled workforce, and American businesses will pay the price.

H.R. 2353 aligns CTE programs with industry needs, promotes work-based learning, and supports career counselors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. H.R. 2353 aligns CTE programs with industry needs, promotes work-based learning, and supports career counselors while strengthening Federal investment in CTE.

I encourage my colleagues to support students, businesses, and their local economies by supporting this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for sponsoring this legislation.

I rise today to voice my strong support for the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, H.R. 2353. In today's economy, we know that not everyone follows the same path into the workforce. Whether a student wants to pursue a

job in the auto industry, healthcare, energy, or IT, the reforms we are advancing will help aspiring workers get the hands-on experience they need to thrive in the 21st century workforce.

This bill is particularly important for my home State of Michigan, the heartland of American manufacturing, where high-skilled jobs are a vital component of our State's economy. I am also glad it includes my bipartisan provisions to address outdated and burdensome occupational licensing requirements.

As I meet with educators, workers, and manufacturers across my district, I consistently hear about the need to improve CTE programs and close the skills gap. Let's pass this bipartisan bill and help more men and women in Michigan and across the country secure fulfilling and good-paying jobs.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois for his leadership on this bill; and also to Congressman THOMPSON for all he has done to bring this to where it is today, because millions of students and workers are eager to advance into good-paying, high-skilled technical careers.

From childcare to manufacturing, to carpentry or computer science, jobs that require technical training are in high demand, and we want to make sure that students across the country have the skills they need to get hired and develop their careers.

With this bill, we will help strengthen the Perkins career and technical education program that reaches over 11 million students every year. This bill will help policymakers measure what does and does not work in career and technical education, allowing us to build on past successes. It will ensure our CTE programs are aligned with the needs of high-demand growth industries to make sure that America is competitive globally, and it will support work-based learning and apprenticeships, and our early education and childcare workforce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. This will bring the Perkins program into the modern, 21st century global economy. This has broad bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this act, and I urge them to fully fund the CTE programs and reject the proposed cuts of \$168 million.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GLENN THOMPSON for yielding. I appreciate his

effective leadership on strengthening America's workforce to create jobs.

I am grateful to speak today on the importance of career and technical education, a critical tool in closing the skills gap and creating jobs.

South Carolina has been successful in promoting career and technical education programs, recruiting Michelin, BMW, Boeing, Bridgestone, MTU, and now Volvo. I hope all communities across America can experience the success we have achieved creating jobs, leading to the lowest unemployment rate in 16 years.

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act will reduce regulations and allow State and local leaders to create CTE programs that are best for their communities by providing greater flexibility of Federal resources, allowing States to respond to their unique educational and economic needs to create jobs for fulfilling lives.

I appreciate the opportunity to encourage my colleagues to pass this bipartisan legislation. These efforts, amplified by President Donald Trump's executive order last week expanding apprenticeship programs, will be an important step forward in our educational system—closing the skills gap and training Americans for meaningful, skilled jobs.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.

I would be remiss if I didn't compliment my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and all of their respective staffs who have worked so hard to bring this really good, strong bipartisan measure here before the Congress for the benefit of the American people.

I have got to tell you: everywhere I go back in Minnesota and around the country, I hear two things when I am talking to businesspeople. And they say, you know, the people who are trained under this career and technical education program are the best employees that we have. The other thing I hear is that we need more of them.

So, again, thanks to my colleagues for bringing this bill forward. There are some good, new provisions in it that gives States an opportunity to focus better on what the needs are in their particular region. There are some other tools to help communities, the program itself, and the businesses to form partnerships to expand the program.

At the end of the day, it is all about creating good, strong jobs with living wages and strong futures. It is about creating opportunities for the working men and women in this country and for the businesses that are at the heart of our economy. And is it about creating a dynamic economy where people can grow and prosper in the 21st century.

It is a good bill for workers. It is a good bill for business. It is a good bill for our economy. And it is a good bill for our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption in the strongest language possible.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask my colleague from North Carolina, the chairwoman of the Education and the Workforce Committee, to engage in a brief colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, Wyoming has used CTE funds to pioneer innovative ways of improving the college and career readiness of our students.

Protecting CTE funding in Wyoming for cutting-edge programs like the Pathway Innovation Center in Casper is crucial, in part, because the previous administration's harmful energy policies that devastated our economy, and we must now work to address a depressed labor market and hedge against future energy market downturns.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairwoman and her committee colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their efforts to reform and reauthorize the CTE programs. However, I have concerns that the bill, as drafted in its current form, could negatively impact my State. Therefore, I can't support it.

Additionally, I know some Members from West Virginia and Louisiana share my concerns.

Therefore, I ask the gentlewoman, would she be willing to work with us as this process moves forward to help address these concerns so we can get a bill to the President's desk that we can all support?

Ms. FOXX. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CHENEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for sharing her perspective, and I look forward to working to address her concerns as we move forward in the legislative process.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support on reauthorizing the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, which really should be just called the JOBS Act. As we have heard from Members all across the country, Members are hearing the same thing from their employer community, which is jobs exist, but skills don't.

What this bill does is it connects people to that job market in response to the fact that the 21st century market is dynamic and changing, and this bill really gets it in terms of getting to that point.

In May, the U.S. Department of Labor reported that there are 5.9 million job openings in the U.S. economy; a record high since they even started collecting that data. So our job as Members of Congress is to update the law and update these programs to align

it with the Workforce Investment Act, which was passed in 2014, and the Every Student Succeeds Act, which was passed again in the last Congress.

This will be the final piece of the puzzle, which will, again, make sure that millions of Americans will have the opportunity to have good-paying jobs that they can support themselves and their families. In sector after sector, whether it is IT, whether it is healthcare, whether it is advanced manufacturing, all are going to benefit from this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate both of the sponsors for their great work on this, and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2353. This bill will reform our career and technical education system, and strengthen the programs in my district in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, there are jobs available in my district right now, but there aren't enough trained workers. This bill will help businesses and schools partner to prepare students for jobs in today's in-demand industries.

We need to accommodate the needs of many different types of students like Steve Nunemaker from Ephrata, Pennsylvania, who, at the age of 47, graduated from Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology with a degree in engineering computer-aided drafting.

CTE programs are vital to training workers for new careers. The jobs that are available are good, family-sustaining jobs. So many people in this country are ready to learn and eager to work.

I would like to thank again Representatives THOMPSON and KRISHNAMOORTHY for their leadership, and I rise to urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

I recently had the opportunity to visit our new Pathways in Technology Early College, or P-TECH, program at Skyline High School in Colorado.

P-TECH is a partnership between the St. Vrain Valley School District, Front Range Community College, and IBM. It allows students to earn a high school diploma and an associate's degree in 5 or 6 years through dual enrollment.

I spoke with a number of students participating in P-TECH and they shared with me how the program equips them with the skills they need to get a well-paying, reliable job after

graduation. That is exactly the kind of innovation Congress should be supporting, and I am proud that the Perkins reauthorization bill does just that.

I urge this bill's final passage in the House, and I call on my colleagues in the Senate to take up this bipartisan legislation as soon as possible so more students can enjoy the kinds of opportunities that the students at the P-TECH High School and St. Vrain Valley School District do.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), a member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353.

Not only does this legislation authorize more available funding for CTE programs, it also gives States more freedom to support CTE activities in rural districts like mine.

□ 1415

This bill also gives authority back to the States to approve CTE plans rather than require Federal approval.

In the short time I have been in Congress, I have seen firsthand the unique differences across each of our States and districts. Increasing flexibility will enable States to have the flexibility to create and support programs that fit their unique workforce needs.

I am excited to be an original cosponsor of this legislation and look forward to its passage later today. Helping our young people transition from school into meaningful careers is one of the best ways we can move our Nation into a vibrant 21st century economy.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of career and technical education. While this bipartisan bill makes needed improvements to current law, during the committee markup I offered and later withdrew an amendment to provide more Federal support for skill development and training programs for ex-offenders who need a second chance and opportunity.

Ex-offenders, who are disproportionately young men of color due to the bias in the criminal justice system, face numerous hurdles when they try to reintegrate into society after serving their time. Finding a decent job is a necessary first step towards developing self-esteem and self-sufficiency. Unfortunately, and too often, a prior criminal history is a barrier to ex-offenders seeking employment.

I withdrew my amendment because of the important work. Nevertheless, it is my view that my amendment should be considered as this bill advances to future conference consideration. Let's help stop recidivism for this special population.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia

(Mr. ALLEN), who is a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

Last week, President Trump laid out a plan to expand educational opportunities for American workers. President Trump's dedication to workforce development is admirable, and I am glad we have a President who has made this a priority.

As someone who has worked in the construction industry for my entire career, I know firsthand how difficult it can be to find skilled workers. In fact, I spoke at the Associated Builders and Contractors breakfast this morning, and they reported that there will be over 1 million job openings in the construction industry in the next few years.

I have met with many industries in my district. The workforce is aging. There aren't enough people who currently have the skills to take over, and it can take nearly 2 years for people to be fully trained for these positions.

First and foremost, it is our responsibility to make sure that young people today are equipped for the job market of tomorrow. Getting an education is essential, but it is equally important that our education efforts are aligned with the in-demand jobs in our communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill will bridge the gap between the business community and education, which is critical to prepare America's future workforce.

I am happy to cosponsor this important bill, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in voting for H.R. 2353.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), who is the vice ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act is an important step in educating students and preparing them for the workforce. It increases opportunities for historically underserved students. It strengthens alignment between CTE programs and stakeholders. It includes the amendment I worked on with Representative STEFANIK to encourage CTE programs to integrate arts and design skills.

This bill will support more programs that respond to local workforce demands and teach advanced skills and creative thinking, like the one I just visited at Portland Community College. Employers, including Intel, support the school's new STEAM Lab,

where students are pursuing certificates and degrees in fields like microelectronics technology.

The Federal Government does have an important enforcement role, and I am disappointed that the bill weakens the Department of Education's ability to hold States accountable for improving low-quality CTE programs. But despite that concern, this bill is worthy of support.

I thank Chairwoman FOXX, Ranking Member SCOTT, Representative THOMPSON, and Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY for their bipartisan work, and I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS), an Education and the Workforce Committee member.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. THOMPSON for his leadership and hard work on this important legislation.

Too often, students across the country leave school without the necessary skills to compete in the modern economy. As the cost of a 4-year degree continues to soar higher and higher and students are taking on greater debt, employers across this country are struggling to find skilled workers to fill good, high-paying jobs. Career and technical education bridges the gap between the classroom and the workplace, offering students a clear pathway to a meaningful career.

I am pleased this legislation includes my amendment supporting dual and concurrent enrollment. By allowing high school students to begin earning postsecondary credit, dual enrollment can shorten the time to degree or credential completion, puts students on the fast track to a good job, and saves families a significant amount of money. Students who participate in dual enrollment are more likely to continue and pursue postsecondary education, less likely to need remediation, and more likely to complete a degree.

My district is lucky to be home to a great technical college that does its job. For example, in Rosemount, Minnesota, Dakota County Technical College partners with local employers to provide students customized training that fits employer-specific needs.

I am proud to support this important legislation that will increase opportunity and prepare students with the skills to succeed.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 8¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Since coming to Congress, I have visited with business leaders across my

district, such as Cindy, the plant manager at Train in Charlotte, and educators at local colleges like Central Piedmont Community College. Each stressed the importance of educating our workforce to fill existing available jobs and to train for jobs of the future.

We must close the skills gap through innovation and work-based learning opportunities such as those provided through the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

CTE improves collaboration between secondary and postsecondary schools, employers, industry, and community partners, giving students, regardless of their background, access to quality job training and the opportunity to earn well-paying jobs without having to complete a 4-year degree. This training is critical to closing the opportunity gap that exists in communities like mine in Mecklenburg County.

IBM, which employs more than 1,300 people in the 12th District, wrote to me just last week to remind us that jobs in growing technology fields demand candidates with high-tech skills that don't always require a traditional degree.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in reauthorizing CTE to continue modernizing today's workforce training and securing America's future.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, one good thing about voting for this bill is the rhetoric we are hearing from this Chamber today. It sounds like the drumbeat from high school guidance counselors, college recruiters, and politicians kowtowing to the education lobby that everybody has to go to a 4-year college or that it is even wise for people to go to a 4-year college is beginning to come to an end.

I am glad, under this bill, we are going to make it easier for students to get a degree focused on skills. For some, that degree could be 1 year; for some, it could be 2 years. Frequently, these degrees lead to jobs that are higher paying than many jobs that you get after you have a 4-year degree.

Not only are they higher paying, but I think they result in more job security because you are not a generalist who will get laid off when you are 45 or 50 and not find a job. But if you have a skill, that skill is something in which you can still get a job when you are 50, 55, 60, or 65. Therefore, I am proud to announce for this bill today.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my friend from Illinois and also my friend Mr. THOMPSON for this bipartisan bill. I am happy to support it and hear all of my colleagues enthusiastically support it.

Career and technical education gives students the opportunity to get technical experience regardless of whether

their next step out of high school is to immediately join the workforce or to go to college.

In my district, I have had the opportunity to visit many students in programs that benefit from the inclusions of career pathways in their high school curriculum. Mt. Diablo High School students, for example, create a farm-to-table restaurant experience, while Pittsburgh High Schoolers design computer animations as a part of the school's Green Engineering Academy. At De Anza High School in Richmond, California, they run an Information Technology Academy focusing on IT career skills, while providing their community IT services free of charge.

By enacting this bipartisan legislation, Congress will affirmatively take steps to update our Nation's educational vision and will propel today's students into tomorrow's workforce.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT), who is a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

The economy is not growing as it should be—about 0.7 percent last quarter—and according to many of the employers in my district, our workforce is not prepared to meet the needs of today, let alone the future.

This legislation is important because it recognizes that we need an education system that best prepares our kids for the future—a future in business—as soon as they hit K-12, and they should be ready to enter the job market or move on to additional training. Traditional 4-year colleges and universities cannot be the only pathway for the next generation of students.

In Virginia, there were nearly 110,000 postsecondary students enrolled in CTE courses in the 2014 year. Programs I am privileged to represent in Virginia's Seventh Congressional District include Amelia Nottoway Technical Center, the Chesterfield Governor's Career and Technical Academy, and Chesterfield County Public Schools Governor's Health Sciences Academy.

While these innovative programs in my district have excelled, technical skills and on-the-job training must be ingrained in the thinking of our entire K-12 educational system, across the curriculum, in every class. I believe this bill is a positive step in that direction.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding me the time.

Certainly, we are in the House today and sending a very clear message that career and technical skills matter, and I rise in support of this bill. For a 4-year college, that pathway is certainly

great for some, but not all. Technical training helped shape my life from community college to the construction site and, yes, here to Congress.

Career and technical education, or CTE, is often overlooked, and it shouldn't be. We need electricians and computer programmers just as much as we need doctors and engineers. In my State of New Jersey, 9 out of 10 of the fastest growing occupations don't require a 4-year degree, but they do require a certificate or on-the-job training.

This is an important reauthorization bill that will go a long way to providing students with opportunities to build skills that they need for those fast-growing, high-paying jobs.

I want to thank the sponsors for including my provision that will allow high schools to give more information on that career path in technical education.

Don Borden, who is the president of Camden County College in my State, says that we have an "understanding of the types of educational programs we need to provide for our students," and that "will lead to meaningful employment."

This is about employment and careers, to train the students on available curriculum, on available jobs. I urge support of this jobs bill.

□ 1430

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

I urge all Members to vote for this bipartisan bill that allows our educational institutions the ability to better adapt their programs to the specific needs of their students. This bill will give States and localities more flexibility in how to use Federal money for career and technical education programs, which will ultimately help Americans find the jobs they need.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. This important legislation would allow more Americans to enter the workforce with the skills needed to compete for high-skilled, in-demand jobs.

Delaware employers tell me they need a skilled workforce. CTE support is a vital tool in addressing the skills gap in many industries in our country. Our support ensures that all students have access to high-quality CTE programs. It allows States to strengthen these programs, providing hands-on

learning opportunities that lead to higher graduation rates as well as better postsecondary and career options.

In 2012, Delaware started Pathways to Prosperity to give high school students an industry-recognized certificate, college credits, and relevant work experience, all before they graduate. In 2 years, it has grown from 30 students to over 6,000 students, who are now better suited to determine their next steps and build a career.

I thank Mr. THOMPSON and also Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY for their leadership, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Congressman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

As a former manufacturer, I have experienced firsthand the importance of career technical education in promoting meaningful work. It is especially helpful for helping people transition from a social safety net or a second-chance program, but I have seen it firsthand. For high school students and for adults who change careers, it can truly change lives.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation. I am confident it can do for our country what it has done in the Eighth District of Ohio.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his great work on this bill that would reauthorize a program that is critical to both American workers and businesses, and the future of our American economy.

I am continuously hearing from family-owned manufactures across my district, such as Atlas Tool and Die and ODM, that they cannot find workers with the skills they need to fill good-paying jobs. I hear this from companies also like Boeing, Intel, and Abbott. At the same time, millions of Americans are struggling to find jobs, but they don't have the skills that they need.

This bill addresses this problem by supporting career and technical education programs that are matched to regional, State, and local labor markets. These applied science, technology, engineering and mathematics, or STEM education programs, are an important component of the innovation engine that drives our economy.

As we work to move innovative technologies into the marketplace, we need a skilled workforce to build and implement them. We also need to make sure that our innovation economy benefits all Americans, especially the middle class.

I thank my colleagues for this bill and urge all my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I want to thank Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY for all his work on this bill, and I thank the Republicans for their work. It is a good, bipartisan bill. It is something that America needs to help strengthen our economy and help strengthen America's middle class.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would like to thank my staff and committee staff for all their work on this bill. I especially want to thank Alex Payne, the lead committee staffer on career and technical education from our side, who, unfortunately, couldn't be here with us today, due to the death of his father. I want to thank Congressman THOMPSON for his incredible leadership on this bill for all these years.

I also want to say that the main purpose of this bill is to coordinate what is taught in CTE classes with workforce demands. H.R. 2353 requires State plans to show how CTE curricula aligns with in-demand careers. School districts must consult business leaders, educators, parents, community leaders, representatives of special populations, and others to determine the most promising career fields. This bipartisan bill gives everyone a seat at the table and makes sure no one is left behind.

I also want to thank Chairwoman Foxx and Ranking Member SCOTT for their incredible leadership on this bill.

I want to take note of the fact that this is a bipartisan bill, at a time when bipartisanship is so needed in this town. I urge the Senate to take up our bill, and I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2353 has the power to improve the lives of countless Americans. By modernizing career and technical education, we can help prepare more men and women from all walks of life to succeed in the workforce.

I would like to note that it is important we continue to fund these programs at the authorized levels so the programs can adequately serve students of all ages. We really have an opportunity to make a positive difference today, and I couldn't be prouder of the bipartisan work that went into this.

Once again, I want to thank Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY as well as all the members of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. I would be remiss not to thank my education staff on my team, Katie Brown; Education and the Workforce staffers, James Redstone and Alex Payne; and all of our colleagues, for their diligent work on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote in favor of H.R. 2353, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act is a long overdue reform and

reauthorization of the federal career and technical education (CTE) program. Unfortunately, I remain concerned that the bill included changes to the funding formula for states that would result in significant cuts to CTE funding for West Virginia and several other states beginning in 2021.

The removal of a hold harmless provision will result in a direct loss of \$4.07 million to West Virginia, a cut of nearly 20 percent over a three-year period. Given West Virginia's economic struggles in recent years, we can ill afford drastic cuts to workforce training programs. As the legislative process continues, I urge the U.S. Senate to find an equitable solution and consider states that will be disadvantaged by the removal of the hold harmless provision.

Without additional changes to the funding formula, in its current form I will oppose the bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

High school, community college, and trade school students in Houston and Harris County, Texas deserve the opportunity to receive a high-quality career and technical education (CTE). CTE education is the pathway for many in our community and throughout our great country to a good paying job and the middle class.

High-quality CTE programs are critical for our nation's economy. Nearly every sector of our economy, from refiners and shipbuilders along the Houston Ship Channel to medical device manufacturers and information technology firms, rely on skilled STEM-educated workers to innovate and compete in the global marketplace.

For over thirty years, the federal government has provided direct support to CTE programs nationwide through the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. Congress has not successfully reauthorized the Perkins Act in 11 years, delaying the needed reforms and additional resources our CTE students deserve.

Today's legislation delivers the reforms and resources that will help improve our local career and technical education programs. The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act will provide states more flexibility in the use of federal resources in response to changes in education and the economy and reduce administrative burdens and simplify the process for states to apply for federal resources. This legislation will increase federal investment in CTE program by nine percent over the life of the authorization and reward success and innovation in CTE program practices that have been proven to best serve students and employers.

I ask all my colleagues to join in supporting this bipartisan legislation that is broadly supported by job creators and educators from across our great nation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Strengthening Career and Technical Education Act.

I devoted 35 years to workforce education so I know the career and economic opportunities possible through technical education. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that there are 90 distinct career paths in my home state—Michigan—offering an average salary of \$50 thousand or more that do not require

a 4 year college degree. That salary is well above the state median annual wage of \$45 thousand.

Yet we lack effective technical training opportunities to reach those paths. Too often young people are unaware of those opportunities and far too often access to career and technical education is lacking. CTE programs give students the opportunities to experience those careers and build skills needed for careers.

This bipartisan legislation updates federal law to support CTE programs and to improve access. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, which reauthorizes the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.

Mr. Speaker, it's estimated that the U.S. spends \$1.6 trillion dollars on human capital development each year. That includes spending on K-12 education, post-secondary education, and employer-based training. In spite of all that spending, fewer than half of Americans ages 25 to 64 have completed a credential beyond high school. All over my district I hear from employers about the need for workers with the right skills. Career and technical education is one way to do this.

I am pleased this legislation encourages states to utilize work-based learning, but I would also note that I think we can further strengthen it by encouraging apprenticeships, both registered and unregistered. As our nation continues to transition itself from analog to digital, so must our workforce. Apprenticeships are needed not only in traditional trades, but also in emerging fields like advanced manufacturing and the technology sector. President Trump demonstrated his commitment to this workforce development model in a speech last week, and I look forward to working on this model with the Chairwoman.

With these important reforms, we can help ensure the labor force of tomorrow has the skills it needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2353, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER SUPPLY PERMITTING COORDINATION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOSAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 392 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1654.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1440

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, the House meets for the second day in a row to consider another infrastructure bill that has come from the House Natural Resources Committee and its Subcommittee on Water, Power, and Oceans, of which I have the honor of chairing. My subcommittee has a strong infrastructure agenda, already hearing testimony on a number of bills aimed at improving our Nation's infrastructure and advancing an all-of-the-above energy and water strategy.

Many of our bills, including H.R. 1654, which we are considering today, apply simple solutions to expedite maintenance or construction of water and power infrastructure throughout the Nation. It is vital to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure, and one of the biggest roadblocks is the excess of regulatory red tape that applicants have to wade through before they can even move one shovel of dirt.

In Colorado, where I live, a water project was recently completed where water owned by the city of Colorado Springs was taken from a reservoir 60 miles to the south to the city of Colorado Springs for treatment and distribution. The project took 6 years to build. But before that could happen, there were over 200 permits and applications that had to be granted, any one of which could have stopped the whole thing, and that cost \$160 million in application fees, lawyers' time, and mitigation. That took 8 years. That took longer than the project itself.

Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK's Water Supply Permitting Coordination

Act seeks to cut regulatory red tape by creating a one-stop-shop permitting process to the Bureau of Reclamation in order to streamline the current multiagency permitting processes for new or expanded non-Federal surface storage facilities.

However, this bill is not a one-size-fits-all approach. Mr. MCCLINTOCK's bill allows water storage project sponsors the flexibility to opt out of this process and, instead, choose the agency and process that works best for them.

While the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act will allow for much-needed relief in the sponsor's State of California, this bill will benefit States throughout the West, including my own State of Colorado.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK's bill goes hand-in-hand with language in the WIIN Act, which was signed into law last year, that supports additional water storage capacity across the West.

I commend my colleague, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for bringing up this commonsense piece of legislation that simply looks to cut regulatory red tape for water storage projects that are essential to survival in the West.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my House colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are debating today what is being called an infrastructure bill. I wish that were actually the case. Our country certainly needs Congress to take action to address our country's infrastructure needs, yet this Congress is spending its time today debating another sham infrastructure bill that won't actually provide a single cent for real infrastructure.

Our Nation currently spends less on infrastructure as a percentage of our GDP than at any time during the past 20 years, and it shows. Far too many areas around the country have infrastructure that is crumbling before our eyes. We have seen this occur with the recent tragedy and the situation for water at the Oroville Dam in California, and this bill offers no solutions for these issues. In truth, this bill is simply an environmental deregulation bill disguised as an infrastructure bill.

Now, the bill's proponents have claimed that environmental laws, and specifically NEPA, are blocking new dam construction. This claim, Mr. Chairman, simply put, is bunk. According to the Bureau of Reclamation, not a single dam has been denied construction because of a lack of coordination between Reclamation and other agencies or because of delays associated with environmental review or permitting.

So why do we not see all sorts of new dams sprouting up around the West like we did for years and years in the previous century?

Because there is no new water to be captured, and because, frankly, all the

best dam locations around the West were taken in the previous century when we had a heck of a dam-building spree.

New dams don't get built because they don't yield enough water to justify their multibillion-dollar price tags. You can ask the CRS if you don't believe other experts. In 2012, the Congressional Research Service found that the most likely causes of delay for major infrastructure projects are a lack of funding and State permitting issues, not environmental laws.

Now, new surface storage may be appropriate in some cases. The fact is, however, that much of the United States is already saturated with dams because of that dam-building spree we had in the previous century. The United States built tens of thousands of dams in the 20th century. California alone built 1,400 major dams. The best dam sites are already taken. Other than extraordinarily wet years like this one, thankfully, in California we are having a hard time even filling up the reservoirs that we already built.

Despite these facts, my Republican colleagues continue to peddle this fiction that we have to gut our Nation's environmental laws to build new dams and other infrastructure. I guess we should not be surprised because this crusade against our Nation's environmental laws is being led by a President whose relationship with the truth is complicated at best.

A couple of weeks ago, President Trump claimed that projects like the Hoover Dam were built in 5 years because they didn't have to go through years of permitting and regulation that current infrastructure projects are subjected to.

Well, the independent fact checkers at The Washington Post evaluated this claim and they awarded the President's claim, as you can see to my right, three Pinocchios, which is the rating for statements that include "significant factual error and/or obvious contradictions."

Now, the fact checkers noted that, according to the U.S. GAO, 95 percent of public infrastructure projects are actually excluded from environmental reviews under current law. They further pointed out that the President ignored the many years of planning, permitting, negotiating, and preparing that was required to make sure that projects like the Hoover Dam were financially feasible and actually had public support.

In fact, dam planning on the Colorado River began in 1902, yet the Hoover Dam was not completed until 1937. Not completed, I might add, until the Roosevelt administration put actual public infrastructure dollars on the table to get that project financed and moving. The project took many years because, even despite the absence of modern environmental laws, big complicated projects take time to plan and finance, and they always have.

I am sorry that my Republican colleagues refuse to let such facts get in

the way of their decades-long crusade against our country's bedrock environmental laws, but I hope we will eventually move on from this debate and get on to addressing real problems affecting our infrastructure, and that real problem is investment.

In terms of water infrastructure, our Nation is still not making necessary investments like water reuse projects and recycling projects. These are 21st century infrastructure projects that can provide us with water supplies that don't depend on the whims of an increasingly unpredictable hydrology. Given our changing climate, we can no longer rely exclusively on our 20th century infrastructure projects like dams.

Despite this, we have barely scratched the surface on building modern water infrastructure projects like reuse, recycling, desalination, groundwater storage, storm water capture, and water-use efficiency projects. Our country currently reuses less than 10 percent of our Nation's wastewater. Climate change will require us to do better. As George W. Bush's Reclamation Commissioner once said, the reuse of wastewater and recycled water could actually be the next river for the Western United States to tap for critical water supply.

This Congress should be working across the aisle to fully tap that next great river for the 21st century.

Reoperating existing facilities, modernizing those operations, is another example of something we should be working together on across the aisle.

All around the West we are dealing with dams and reservoirs that are being operated with the best technology from decades ago. The flood control manual at Oroville Dam, for example, hasn't been updated since 1970, which actually makes it cutting edge when compared to many of the reservoirs that are operating on 1950s flood control manuals. We are using slide rules instead of computers, with meteorological predictions that are based on historic data, backward-looking data, instead of looking up at the sky and using the data from modern satellite technology.

At Folsom Dam, we are watching a long overdue update to operations as part of a new auxiliary spillway. Forecast-informed operations, which is something that I have long advocated as part of comprehensive water legislation, is something we could work on together, and it would provide significant increases in water supply.

If my Republican friends are interested in expediting environmental reviews for infrastructure projects, then there is another thing that we can work on together, and that is we can end the slashing of budgets in Federal agencies that are in charge of environmental reviews for infrastructure projects. Budget cuts do nothing but hamper the ability of these agencies to participate in the review process and to protect our other Nation's fisheries and other natural resources.

This bill before us today compounds the problem by further undercutting the important role these agencies play to protect our natural resources. That is why several conservation and fishing industry groups have warned that this Congress should reject this bill, that it threatens tens of thousands of jobs in the fishing industry across the Pacific Coast.

Many of our Nation's iconic fisheries are already on the brink of extinction. We have heard firsthand in our committee from the fishermen struggling to pay their mortgages, boats being scrapped because owners can't pay mooring fees, homes being repossessed, and restaurants, hotels, and other retail and service businesses struggling just to scrape by. Let's not add to these struggles by passing an ill-conceived bill that does nothing to actually improve our infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. Members are advised and reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his work on this.

Mr. Chairman, I always get excited when I hear people speak on the floor, especially when they come from California. Mr. Chairman, it is always interesting when people want to tell us what is the best way to make things happen.

It is interesting, in California, when the legislature was controlled by Democrats, they did waive CEQA, but it wasn't for a dam. It wasn't to prepare for a drought we were going through. But they waived it twice, all for sports. One was in San Francisco, and one was in L.A. It seems odd, but sometimes people have their priorities, I guess, not in the right place.

Now, Mr. Chairman, California and the West recently endured the worst drought in our century. Though it was the worst drought, this was not our first. We have faced droughts for generations, and each time the rain and snow came back and delivered the water that we needed to survive.

Just like previous years, this past winter was a godsend to Californians; the wettest on record. Living in the naturally dry region that we do, you would think it would be common practice to prepare for inevitable times of drought by capturing water when Mother Nature blesses us with the rain and snow. But the fact is that we aren't doing enough to store the water we do get for the times we don't get it.

So what can we do now? What would help the people in our district and across California and across the West to prepare for future droughts that we know are coming?

We should start by building more dams and reservoirs.

So what is stopping us?

Well, some is a ridiculous permitting process that forces us to wait and wait and wait when actually we should be acting.

Just look at history. Take the High Savery Dam in Wyoming. It took 14 years to permit the project but only 2 years to build it. It was finished in 2004. Think about how much the world has changed in those 14 years of time.

In 1990, somewhere around 5 million people had cell phones and only about 15 percent of Americans owned a computer. By 2004, when the dam was finished, about 180 million people had cell phones and 62 percent of Americans owned a computer. In 1990, the most popular movie was *Total Recall*. By 2004, we were already on to *Shrek 2*.

Looking forward to my home State, we can't wait 14 years after starting the permitting process to finish our projects. The Temperance Flat Reservoir, once fully operational, can provide enough water to meet the needs of 172,000 households for an entire year. Finishing the Sites Reservoir proposal could provide 2 million California homes with enough water for a year. That is an astounding number. But, Mr. Chairman, I am sure on this floor we will hear those 2 million should actually wait. But I guess for a baseball stadium, no need to wait.

So fixing the process isn't just about saving some headaches or a few hours of time. This is about making sure millions of people in California and across America have the water they need and deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK for this legislation. Fixing this permitting process for water storage is more than just common sense. It is about making us a nation of doers again to get the American what they actually need.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK has worked. He has tried to work with both sides of the aisle. He has been through this process.

But you know what?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK has been home. He has been listening to his constituents on both sides of the aisle that don't have water. We have been through these droughts. We know these droughts will come again, and they have only been worse in the last couple of years.

Why?

Because of what has been imposed by the Federal Government. Even in the years where we have more than 170 percent of snowpack, we don't keep the guarantee of 100 percent of the water.

So as the environmental laws continue to take water away and put it out to the ocean instead of providing for the fruits to be grown and the fiber across our country and provide the water for the citizens of California, we should build more dams, and they should not have to wait 14 years with only 2 years to build it. We can do bet-

ter, we should do better, and we will do better when we pass this bill.

□ 1500

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I was in the California Legislature for at least one of the those environmental waiver bills that the majority leader referenced involving an NFL stadium, and I am glad to hear him criticize that because I, too, criticized it. It was a bipartisan mistake. I voted against it.

There was a bit of vindication because at least one of those stadiums ended up not getting built anyway, despite the environmental waiver, and it sort of exposed the fact that these environmental laws are often put forward as scapegoats. We are often told that if you just clear away the environmental permitting, we can do these things.

There were many other reasons why that stadium didn't get built, complicated issues involving NFL franchises and financing, which is usually the real scapegoat when these projects aren't moving forward. So it is a worthy example to talk about in the context of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on the Water, Power, and Oceans Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, droughts are nature's fault; they happen. But water shortages are our fault. Water shortages are a choice that we made a generation ago when we stopped building new reservoirs to meet the needs of a growing population.

The unvarnished truth is we will not solve our water shortages until we build more reservoirs, and we cannot build new reservoirs until we overhaul the laws that have made their construction endlessly time-consuming and, ultimately, cost-prohibitive.

For years, the Natural Resources Committee has heard testimony from frustrated water districts unable to navigate the Byzantine maze of regulations and the phalanx of competing, overlapping, duplicative, and often contradictory Federal agencies.

After years spent trying to satisfy one agency, another suddenly pops up to claim jurisdiction with an entirely new set of demands in an often endless permitting process, despite the fact they are studying the same project in the same location with the same data. The burden this places on our ability to deliver water for the next generation is crushing.

The leader mentioned the High Savery Dam in Wyoming—14 years to permit, only 2 years to actually build. The Federal Government has literally studied four storage projects in California nearly to death. One project, the Sites Reservoir, had over 50 alternative

locations studied, and there is no end in sight for the feasibility process on that potential reservoir. Similar delays have prevented the expansion of the Shasta reservoir for 39 years.

Mr. HUFFMAN tells us that no dam permits have been denied because of this. The problem is very few dam permits have been approved because of this. And the costs are caused by cost-prohibitive delays in time that run up millions and millions of dollars in costs until the agencies simply throw up their hands and give up.

H.R. 1654 will bring order from this bureaucratic chaos. It establishes a framework in which Federal agencies with permitting responsibilities for the construction of new reservoirs must work together, coordinate their schedules, share data and technical materials, and make their findings publicly available. The end result will be fewer delays, more efficient use of taxpayer dollars, and, ultimately, more abundant water supplies.

It is modeled on the Obama administration's approach to constructing new electric transmission lines to accommodate its reliance on wind and solar generation. There is nothing new in this process. In October of 2009, the administration formed the Interagency Rapid Response Team for Transmission, a consortium of nine Federal agencies to coordinate a single unified environmental review document for each project analysis.

It is also modeled on provisions sponsored by House Democrats that expedited improvements on the Hetch Hetchy dam serving the San Francisco region. This bill simply says, if there is a potential project on Interior or Agriculture Department lands, then the Bureau of Reclamation will be the coordinating agency for the permits. That is a one-stop permitting agency.

It will call together all of the agencies, the local and State jurisdictions and tribal governments of our Indian nations, establish a timeframe for studying decisionmaking, and then coordinate all the reviews and analyses and opinions and statements and permits or licenses and other Federal approvals required under Federal law.

It also requires transparency, assuring that all data is available to the public online so the science guiding these decisions can be rigorously scrutinized by all interested parties.

It also allows water agencies to fund the review process if Federal funding isn't provided, removing one of the excuses that Federal agencies have made in slow-walking or stalling project reviews.

I want to make this very clear: It does not bypass or alter or waive any environmental or safety laws. It doesn't waive CEQ or ESA or NEPA or any other law. It simply says the process needs to be more efficient, and the government agencies should coordinate and cooperate with each other rather than talking past each other as isolated and often inscrutable fiefdoms.

Five years of drought in California brought entire cities within months of exhausting their water supplies. The epic drought has now been followed with the wettest year on record, and we have helplessly watched our dams spilling millions of acre-feet of water to the ocean because we have no place to store the excess for the next drought.

Perhaps that is nature's way of reminding us that, if we didn't store water in wet years, we won't have it during dry ones, and the economic and social devastation have been immense.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, if you want to misuse our environmental laws to block any new water storage, well, then you should vote against this bill. We will continue to see increasingly severe water shortages and spiralling water and electricity bills.

But if you want to preserve our environmental laws, you ought to be supporting this bill because it places those laws back within a workable and practical framework, and it places our society back on the road to an era of abundance where our children can enjoy green lawns and gardens, brightly lit homes, and abundant and affordable groceries from America's agricultural cornucopia.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, the State of California is being mentioned quite a bit in this conversation.

It bears noting that the State of California is not asking for this legislation; and, in fact, the State of California has consistently opposed the rolling back of environmental standards and is busy passing bill after bill in this State legislative session to try to backfill for anticipated rollbacks in Federal environmental standards. So, certainly, if we are talking about the State of California and what it wants and it needs, its elected leaders are taking a very different direction than posing the false choice between environmental standards and infrastructure.

Again, the United States Bureau of Reclamation has emphasized that there are other factors, that it is not environmental review that has stopped any water projects in the West. The Congressional Research Service has reached the same conclusion.

And I just heard from my friend, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, that we can't build new reservoirs until we change these laws. Well, I have got to point out that California has built new reservoirs under current law. You can ask the folks in Contra Costa County about Los Vaqueros Reservoir.

They didn't need any environmental waivers or special legislation. They built their dam. And in fact, they are getting ready to move forward with an expansion of that surface storage project. It should be broadly supported,

and they are not asking for any special tweaks to the environmental laws. The same would apply to Diamond Valley Reservoir in southern California.

And, in fact, we have actually added nearly 6 million acre-feet of new surface and groundwater storage over the past few decades in California, all while honoring bedrock environmental protections like ESA and NEPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Centennial State of Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, Representative MCCLINTOCK, for putting forward a very sensible piece of legislation.

The Colorado Water Congress, who supports this bill, stated in their letter:

The economic viability of the State of Colorado is dependent on safe and reliable water supply. In recent years, the ability of water managers to meet growth demand and to create water storage has become more challenging.

In Colorado, the Windy Gap Project, whose formal environmental permitting process began in 2003, won't see construction start until at least 2019, with water storage ready by 2022—16 years to permit, 3 years to build.

For too long, Federal agencies have failed to properly coordinate and time their reviews of water supply project applications, resulting in missed opportunities for increased water storage during our wetter seasons.

Water is the lifeblood of Western communities. Without it, most communities in the Western United States could not survive, so it only makes sense to store as much of it as we reasonably can during those wetter years. Yet the Federal Government presents roadblock after roadblock that prevents a timely and cost-effective completion to many of these projects.

This legislation will streamline the permitting process and increase agency accountability by placing the Bureau of Reclamation at the center of the process and ensuring all other agencies are required to report to it in a timely fashion.

It is an effective piece of legislation, an effective approach to a problem that should not exist. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Fresno, California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, this is an issue that is, I think, one of most important long-term issues that we deal with not only in California and Western States but, really, in the world, because the fact is that water is a crucial element of the sustainability of all of us, and it always has been.

With the planet clicking 7 billion people a couple of years ago, soon to be 9 billion people by the middle of this century, with climate change clearly impacting our ability to manage our water supplies, we must look at the

long-term needs of using all the water tools in our water toolbox. And this is one effort to, in fact, look at how we can provide additional storage capacity not only in California, but elsewhere, so that when we have these periodic times—and we measure water on 10-year averages.

We have had near-record rainfall and snow in the snow-packed mountains of California, which we were blessed with the last 4 months. And after five of the most extremely dry periods of time, to have this rain and snow is wonderful.

But we know that you have got to plan for the future. And so in cases like California where it is either feast or famine, having an additional water reservoir supply is one of the important water management tools in our water toolbox, along with conservation, along with better irrigation technologies which we are implementing, along with conservation of all sorts of kinds, desalinization. All of these matter, as does storage.

This year, millions and millions of acre-feet of water have gone unused because of the lack of storage. This measure will help, but there are other things that we have to do to fix the broken water system in California, in the West, and, really, we can be a template if we better manage our water resources for the entire planet in the light of climate change.

I ask that we support this legislation. It is helpful, and we must do much more.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from California for supporting this very important legislation.

We all, all of us in California, have experienced what happens when you have radical environmentalist nonsense determining policy. We have just gone through one of the worst droughts in our history, yet during that drought, those wonderful California environmental planners saw to it that billions of gallons of freshwater were dumped into the ocean instead of being redirected towards producing food crops in our Central Valley area or providing water to drink or providing water so that people could afford to have water throughout our State. Instead, it was dumped into the ocean.

Now, what we needed and what we need now that the drought is over is more water storage because we are in favor of people, not some grandiose concepts of what a better view counts—now, without people in it, that is, of course.

Now we need to think about what our policies will impact on average people. And what we have in this radical environmental approach is opposition to storing water, now that we have some extra water, right after a drought.

Now, whose side are you on?

You can't tell me you are on the side of ordinary people, because when water

prices go up and there is not enough water for the crops, the price of food goes up and the price of water goes up.

Who is the worst hurt?

America's lowest income people are the ones who are hurt the most, the ones who can't afford to pay the little extra for food that it costs when it costs more money to grow crops in the middle of a drought.

□ 1515

So with that said, I dramatically support doing something for the people, not some environmental theory—nonsensical theories in most cases—that we are facing doom if we store water.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If we store water, that is going to be bad for the environment? I mean, I am sorry. That makes no sense to me.

And it doesn't make sense to ordinary people either that after a drought, that in some way it is against the environment to make it easier for us to store water so we don't have to have the same destruction and the same lowering of the standard of living of our poorer people when the next drought comes around.

This act by Mr. TOM MCCLINTOCK, H.R. 1654, will make it easier and quicker for us to build these dams. By the way, if we don't do this, many of those dams will probably be built, only we are talking about the evaporation not of water, but of money. After you have to go through years and years of paperwork, what evaporates is the money that should be going into education and transportation programs.

No. It is wrong all the way around not to permit people to go as fast as we can rationally and engineeringwise to build storage for our water supply today so when the next drought comes around, ordinary people won't be hurt.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague from Orange County for those comments. I have been to Orange County and I have seen the cutting-edge water management work taking place in Mr. ROHRABACHER's district. Among other things, they are doing amazing groundwater recharge and water-use efficiency, water recycling. In fact, they have got one of the most cutting-edge potable reuse systems in the country. It is their reliance on those 21st century water management tools instead of large reservoirs—that, for the most part, were running dry during this drought we just went through—that enabled them to get through the most critical drought any of us have ever seen in much better shape than any communities around the State.

So kudos to the forward-looking water managers in Orange County. But if the gentleman is concerned about

low-income people being impacted by water shortage and water management issues, I really hope he will pay a visit to my district, because on the north coast of California, you get the other end of this water management challenge.

The fishing communities of the north coast have been hammered by the fact that our iconic salmon runs are teetering on the brink of extinction. We have left very little flow in the rivers, and this drought only exacerbated the problem.

So I am representing people that are deeply impacted by water shortage and water management decisions that need to be part of this consideration instead of trivialized when we talk about water wasting out through the estuary. This is water that sustains these fishery runs that have been the lifeblood of the communities in my district for many years.

Now, just to inject a couple of facts into what has been called a radical environmental agenda that caused the waste of all of this water during the drought—in fact, that didn't happen. In 2014, the fact is only 4 percent of all the runoff in the entire Bay Delta Watershed flowed to San Francisco Bay solely for environmental protection. In 2015, it was even less. Two percent of the runoff for the entire watershed made it all the way out to San Francisco Bay solely for environmental purposes. The rest of that flow that made it through was to control salinity in the delta so that you could continue to serve municipal and industrial and other water-use needs. Most of that water was diverted and used.

We need to remember the facts in what can sometimes be a hyperbolic discussion of California water.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GOSAR), who is also a subcommittee chairman on the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1654, legislation sponsored by my good friend and colleague, TOM MCCLINTOCK.

For centuries, Western States have fought over scarce water supplies. We even have an expression in the West that says whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting over.

The water scarcity in the West led our visionary forefathers to build Federal water storage projects throughout to provide water, hydropower, recreation, flood control, and environmental benefits while adhering to State water rights. These were nonpartisan endeavors, as evidenced by President John F. Kennedy dedicating the San Luis Dam in California.

Now, while the Central Arizona Project came after President Kennedy, it continues to bring prosperity to Arizona's cities, tribal communities, and ranches almost 50 years from its inception.

The Glen Canyon Dam and other projects affiliated with the Colorado River Storage Project provided the backbone of a regional economy that produced year-round water and emissions-free hydropower.

Lake Powell, the reservoir behind Glen Canyon, allows for millions of dollars' worth of recreational boating annually and even provided the scenery for the astronaut crash landing in the 1968 science fiction classic, "The Planet of the Apes."

For generations, these projects provided benefits to a growing society, but what the Federal Government helped give, it has been taking away.

The current regulatory process for constructing new surface water storage is a bureaucratic maze that requires numerous permits and approvals from a multitude of different Federal, State, and local agencies. Conflicting requirements continue to cause unnecessary delays, kill jobs, and result in us failing to capture precious water supplies. Ranchers, agricultural and municipal water providers and other stakeholders in the West need a clear process without the bureaucracy.

H.R. 1654 establishes such a process by creating a one-stop-shop permitting shop, with the Bureau of Reclamation in charge of the permitting process for these important water storage projects in 17 Western States. This makes a lot of sense, as the Bureau of Reclamation's multipurpose water projects made the West what it is today. Generations of our prior leaders focused on the need to capture water and deliver it to cities and fields.

Our communities always need water, and with the projected population increases, we are going to need a lot more of it in the near future.

Let's build on the good work of previous generations. Get the bureaucracy out of the way and pass H.R. 1654 so we have a clear process moving forward for preserving worthwhile water infrastructure projects.

There is an old adage: save for a rainy day. In this case, it should be: save on a rainy day.

This act facilitates that very concept.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for sponsoring such needed legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this commonsense bill.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It has been a good conversation, but I hope one thing is clear: this is not an infrastructure bill. This is an environmental deregulation bill that is masquerading behind the issue of infrastructure.

Environmental laws, environmental reviews are not the reason new dams have not been built and it is not the reason new dams will not be built. All of the serious analyses point to other factors, the big one being they don't generate enough water to justify the huge price tags that go along with

these projects. They are just rarely financeable, rarely do they make economic sense. So let's not scapegoat the environmental laws to try to address that problem.

Now, if my colleagues across the aisle are interested in an honest infrastructure bill, including a water infrastructure bill, they will find a lot of willing partners across the aisle, including myself. We have put forth all sorts of ideas. We want to see water infrastructure. Surface storage and new dams can be part of that, but we have got to put real dollars on the table. We have got to do what prior generations did when they got serious about building infrastructure, and not hide behind this ulterior agenda of gutting our environmental laws, repackaging that, and representing that as being responsive to our Nation's critical need for new infrastructure. This bill simply doesn't meet that test.

I request that my colleagues vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I close, I do want to point out a bit of circular reasoning that my friend from California is using. He says that it is not the environmental regulations or the red tape that slows down the construction of dams, it is the high cost. But what he doesn't recognize or is not willing to admit is that the high cost is caused by all the red tape and environmental regulations. So that is arguing in circles, and I don't accept that.

Again, I commend the bill's sponsor for this bill that looks to promote additional and much-needed water storage throughout the West.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1654

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BUREAU.—The term "Bureau" means the Bureau of Reclamation.

(2) COOPERATING AGENCIES.—The term "cooperating agency" means a Federal agency with jurisdiction over a review, analysis, opinion,

statement, permit, license, or other approval or decision required for a qualifying project under applicable Federal laws and regulations, or a State agency subject to section 3(c).

(3) QUALIFYING PROJECTS.—The term "qualifying projects" means new surface water storage projects in the States covered under the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.) constructed on lands administered by the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of any easement, right-of-way, lease, or any private holding, unless the project applicant elects not to participate in the process authorized by this Act.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF LEAD AGENCY AND COOPERATING AGENCIES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF LEAD AGENCY.—The Bureau is established as the lead agency for purposes of coordinating all reviews, analyses, opinions, statements, permits, licenses, or other approvals or decisions required under Federal law to construct qualifying projects.

(b) IDENTIFICATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF COOPERATING AGENCIES.—The Commissioner of the Bureau shall—

(1) identify, as early as practicable upon receipt of an application for a qualifying project, any Federal agency that may have jurisdiction over a review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, approval, or decision required for a qualifying project under applicable Federal laws and regulations; and

(2) notify any such agency, within a reasonable timeframe, that the agency has been designated as a cooperating agency in regards to the qualifying project unless that agency responds to the Bureau in writing, within a timeframe set forth by the Bureau, notifying the Bureau that the agency—

(A) has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the qualifying project;

(B) has no expertise or information relevant to the qualifying project or any review, analysis, opinion, statement, permit, license, or other approval or decision associated therewith; or

(C) does not intend to submit comments on the qualifying project or conduct any review of such a project or make any decision with respect to such project in a manner other than in cooperation with the Bureau.

(c) STATE AUTHORITY.—A State in which a qualifying project is being considered may choose, consistent with State law—

(1) to participate as a cooperating agency; and

(2) to make subject to the processes of this Act all State agencies that—

(A) have jurisdiction over the qualifying project;

(B) are required to conduct or issue a review, analysis, or opinion for the qualifying project; or

(C) are required to make a determination on issuing a permit, license, or approval for the qualifying project.

SEC. 4. BUREAU RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The principal responsibilities of the Bureau under this Act are—

(1) to serve as the point of contact for applicants, State agencies, Indian tribes, and others regarding proposed qualifying projects;

(2) to coordinate preparation of unified environmental documentation that will serve as the basis for all Federal decisions necessary to authorize the use of Federal lands for qualifying projects; and

(3) to coordinate all Federal agency reviews necessary for project development and construction of qualifying projects.

(b) COORDINATION PROCESS.—The Bureau shall have the following coordination responsibilities:

(1) PREAPPLICATION COORDINATION.—Notify cooperating agencies of proposed qualifying

projects not later than 30 days after receipt of a proposal and facilitate a preapplication meeting for prospective applicants, relevant Federal and State agencies, and Indian tribes—

(A) to explain applicable processes, data requirements, and applicant submissions necessary to complete the required Federal agency reviews within the timeframe established; and

(B) to establish the schedule for the qualifying project.

(2) **CONSULTATION WITH COOPERATING AGENCIES.**—Consult with the cooperating agencies throughout the Federal agency review process, identify and obtain relevant data in a timely manner, and set necessary deadlines for cooperating agencies.

(3) **SCHEDULE.**—Work with the qualifying project applicant and cooperating agencies to establish a project schedule. In establishing the schedule, the Bureau shall consider, among other factors—

(A) the responsibilities of cooperating agencies under applicable laws and regulations;

(B) the resources available to the cooperating agencies and the non-Federal qualifying project sponsor, as applicable;

(C) the overall size and complexity of the qualifying project;

(D) the overall schedule for and cost of the qualifying project; and

(E) the sensitivity of the natural and historic resources that may be affected by the qualifying project.

(4) **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.**—Prepare a unified environmental review document for each qualifying project application, incorporating a single environmental record on which all cooperating agencies with authority to issue approvals for a given qualifying project shall base project approval decisions. Help ensure that cooperating agencies make necessary decisions, within their respective authorities, regarding Federal approvals in accordance with the following timelines:

(A) Not later than 1 year after acceptance of a completed project application when an environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact is determined to be the appropriate level of review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(B) Not later than 1 year and 30 days after the close of the public comment period for a draft environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), when an environmental impact statement is required under the same.

(5) **CONSOLIDATED ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD.**—Maintain a consolidated administrative record of the information assembled and used by the cooperating agencies as the basis for agency decisions.

(6) **PROJECT DATA RECORDS.**—To the extent practicable and consistent with Federal law, ensure that all project data is submitted and maintained in generally accessible electronic format, compile, and where authorized under existing law, make available such project data to cooperating agencies, the qualifying project applicant, and to the public.

(7) **PROJECT MANAGER.**—Appoint a project manager for each qualifying project. The project manager shall have authority to oversee the project and to facilitate the issuance of the relevant final authorizing documents, and shall be responsible for ensuring fulfillment of all Bureau responsibilities set forth in this section and all cooperating agency responsibilities under section 5.

SEC. 5. COOPERATING AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **ADHERENCE TO BUREAU SCHEDULE.**—

(1) **TIMEFRAMES.**—On notification of an application for a qualifying project, the head of each cooperating agency shall submit to the Bureau a timeframe under which the cooperating agency reasonably will be able to complete the authorizing responsibilities of the cooperating agency.

(2) **SCHEDULE.**—

(A) **USE OF TIMEFRAMES.**—The Bureau shall use the timeframes submitted under this subsection to establish the project schedule under section 4.

(B) **ADHERENCE.**—Each cooperating agency shall adhere to the project schedule established by the Bureau under subparagraph (A).

(b) **ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD.**—The head of each cooperating agency shall submit to the Bureau all environmental review material produced or compiled in the course of carrying out activities required under Federal law, consistent with the project schedule established by the Bureau under subsection (a)(2).

(c) **DATA SUBMISSION.**—To the extent practicable and consistent with Federal law, the head of each cooperating agency shall submit all relevant project data to the Bureau in a generally accessible electronic format, subject to the project schedule established by the Bureau under subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 6. FUNDING TO PROCESS PERMITS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, after public notice in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Administrative Procedure Act”), may accept and expend funds contributed by a non-Federal public entity to expedite the evaluation of a permit of that entity related to a qualifying project.

(b) **EFFECT ON PERMITTING.**—

(1) **EVALUATION OF PERMITS.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the evaluation of permits carried out using funds accepted under this section shall—

(A) be reviewed by the Regional Director of the Bureau of the region in which the qualifying project or activity is located (or a designee); and

(B) use the same procedures for decisions that would otherwise be required for the evaluation of permits for similar projects or activities not carried out using funds authorized under this section.

(2) **IMPARTIAL DECISIONMAKING.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary and the head of each cooperating agency receiving funds under this section for a qualifying project shall ensure that the use of the funds accepted under this section for the qualifying project shall not—

(A) substantively or procedurally impact impartial decisionmaking with respect to the issuance of permits; or

(B) diminish, modify, or otherwise affect the statutory or regulatory authorities of the cooperating agency.

(c) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.**—None of the funds accepted under this section shall be used to carry out a review of the evaluation of permits required under subsection (b)(1)(A).

(d) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall ensure that all final permit decisions carried out using funds authorized under this section are made available to the public, including on the Internet.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115–186. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115–186.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 2, after the period insert “Such term shall also include State-led projects (as defined in section 4007(a)(2) of the WIIN Act) for new surface water storage projects in the States covered under the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.) constructed on lands administered by the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of any easement, right-of-way, lease, or any private holding, unless the project applicant elects not to participate in the process authorized by this Act.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank my subcommittee chairman, Mr. LAMBORN, for his leadership on this, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK for bringing the bill in chief forward here that I am asking to amend today.

This amendment ensures that State-led projects can also enjoy the coordination that the bill itself will do, State-led surface storage projects such as Sites Reservoir. These will be defined in the WIIN Act and they will be eligible under H.R. 1654’s permitting.

Doing so enables States to direct their own resources towards infrastructure needs at lower cost and improves States’ ability to partner with the Federal Government on projects that provide both State and Federal benefits.

Adopting this amendment to include State-led projects will allow the development of more water infrastructure more rapidly and at no additional cost to the Federal Government. For example, in my home State of California, the voters have approved billions of dollars toward infrastructure projects such as Sites Reservoir—not too far from my neighborhood—which will include enough water storage for millions more people in our State.

Now, if you know the saga of Sites Reservoir, the locals there will tell you they have been talking about it, studying it, poking it, prodding it for about 40 years. Bureaucracy plays a major role in that.

So the bill in chief is not looking to change environmental laws or get rid of environmental laws. Indeed, my colleague on the other side of the aisle talked about having an honest discussion in this area. Well, an honest discussion would show that the bill in chief is one that is merely coordinating. It is not changing the Water Quality Act. It is not changing NEPA, CEQA, or anything else, other than getting these people all in one room to coordinate at one time.

Yes, we, indeed, have costs involved, because people give up, whether it is

private sector money or the people that pass bonds as State voters give up after a while because they don't think their dollars are actually getting to the projects, when they hear needless, endless delays, when we have this game of bureaucratic badminton being played by various agencies knocking one idea to another, taking years of time and additional costs, especially those surprise ones at the last minute.

Lake Oroville is in my own backyard. Now, what we have seen there since the crisis happened with the breakage of the spillway is that coordination under an emergency, where, even though there are some trying to throw roadblocks in there, people recognized coordination was needed, because when 188,000 people have to evacuate an area due to some unknown factors with how the infrastructure is holding up, then they saw the need to fix it.

□ 1530

And the spillway at Lake Oroville is going to be fixed pretty rapidly over a 2-year period and made usable in this short amount of time. So that is how coordination can work to get a needed project done when it can be an emergency.

What we need to quit doing is waiting for emergencies like this and on levee projects when we know for years and years that levee projects—highways, bridges, other infrastructure that have this bureaucratic badminton played when people are trying to get these projects done—need to be coordinated. That is what this bill does.

My amendment adds to it, again, an important ability for State dollars under State-led infrastructure projects to be included in that. So I think it makes a heck of a lot of sense and will help our voters like in California and others around the country to be able to enjoy that coordination.

Mr. LAMBORN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMALFA. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. We support the amendment. It improves the bill by expanding opportunities for increased water storage across the West. I urge its adoption.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Fresno, California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Marin for yielding me 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this amendment offered by my colleague, Congressman LAMALFA. As I said earlier, we need to fix the broken water system in California because reliability is key.

We have a water system that was designed for 20 million people. Today, we

have 40 million people living in California. By the year 2030, we are going to have 50 million people living in California.

The simple truth is that in the San Joaquin Valley, where I live, which has been ground zero for the impact of an unreliable water supply because of this broken system, we have felt the devastation of the drought. This lack of reliability is due to many factors that have intensified as a result of climate change, impact on regulations, and other factors.

Luckily this year, as I noted earlier, it has been a deluge of rain and snow, and for that we are thankful. But we know in California that it is either feast or famine, and so, sadly, we must plan for the future, and that means including surface storage and using subsurface replenishment of our ground water and all the other water tools that are part of this water toolbox that is critical for the long term.

We need more storage. We need the underlying legislation that this provides. While not completely fixing or resolving our challenges, it is a small step, and, as was noted before, this does not amend NEPA or CEQA, but it simply provides a timeline, and a timeline is a good thing.

This collaboration that this legislation envisions is not too different from the collaboration that the Governor is working with the Department of the Interior on, the proposal to fix the plumbing system in the delta. They have a record of decision that has a timeline.

So if surface storage water is going to receive funding and support under the WIIN Act that we passed in December, matching State funds, along with this effort to provide the timeline, will be helpful.

Let me finally say that sustainability of our agricultural economy, sustainability of putting food and fiber on America's dinner table every night, and helping feed other parts of the world is really what we are talking about here. Reliability is key to making sure that we are sustainable under the adverse impacts of a lack of a fixed water system. We need to address this.

This legislation is a small step in providing timelines for certainty for this collaboration for this process to work better. I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague, Mr. COSTA, for his bipartisan support and effort in ensuring we have a proactive way of doing things in California on water infrastructure. I appreciate that a lot.

So for anybody to say that the amount of effort it takes to get past the bureaucratic process, to simply get the existing permits under existing laws, is not burdensome is naive. Indeed, whether we are talking highway projects, levee projects, bridge projects, and, more particularly, this

bill, water storage projects, we need this coordination.

So the coordination will mean more for the American people, more for the people of my own State, with less dollars, less delay, and they can start enjoying the fruits of this project, the fruit of their tax dollars.

So my amendment simply adds to that, State-led efforts, whether it has been a bond passed by a State or other State funding in California and other States, that they, too, can enjoy that coordination that this bill would provide.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I, unfortunately, must oppose this amendment. I am not sure if it was the intent of my friend, Mr. LAMALFA, but it appears that this amendment would prioritize permitting surface storage projects under the WIIN Act and not groundwater storage WIIN Act projects.

The WIIN Act, of course, authorized money for both surface and groundwater storage projects. These projects are yet to be named and prioritized. That still needs to happen.

Yet this amendment applies this bill's streamlining provisions to WIIN's "State-led projects for new surface water storage projects."

Now, providing surface storage above all other types of water infrastructure projects certainly is in keeping with some of the obsession with new dams that we have heard from my colleagues across the aisle. But the truth is, there are all sorts of other worthy projects that are needed if we are going to get serious about water infrastructure in California; and to put a thumb on the scale for one particular kind is not the right way to go.

So, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-186.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 7. CONDITION ON APPLICABILITY.

This Act shall not apply to any project that the Secretary determines could cause harm to commercial fisheries.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 392, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I, like many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, am concerned about

the long-term prospects for water infrastructure and storage in the West.

As the western climate continues to get hotter, we are going to have more hot, dry, drought years. That is why many States and communities, including the cities that I represent, are doing all that they can to make their water infrastructure more resilient, to reduce unneeded runoff, to recycle water, and to store as much ground water as possible.

To support these critical activities, Congress needs to invest in our country's water infrastructure. The bill before us today does not do any of these things. It does not authorize new or additional funding for water projects. It is not an infrastructure bill.

Instead, the bill before us today makes many Americans nervous because it loosens key environmental safeguards and imposes arbitrary deadlines for the approval of dams on our rivers and streams. This bill threatens the health of our streams, our rivers, and coastlines, which could harm fish populations important to commercial fisheries.

Therefore, I am offering a straightforward amendment. It simply requires proposed new dams to go through the normal project review process if they are likely to harm commercial fisheries.

The construction of poorly permitted dams has been a major cause of mortality for California's fisheries. In California's Central Valley, they currently block Chinook salmon and steelhead from more than 90 percent of the historical spawning habitat.

My amendment will help protect my State's economically important fisheries from further harm. Commercial fisheries from my home State sustain thousands of jobs across California and the West Coast, and, currently, we have what can only be described as a fisheries crisis.

Many fisheries are at record-low population levels. According to some estimates, 78 percent of California's native salmon will be extinct or disappear within the next century if current trends continue.

Simply put, many West Coast fishermen and fisherwomen who depend on California's fish runs are hanging on by a thread. The thousands of fishermen and fisherwomen, and other employees of restaurants, hotels, and other businesses that depend on healthy fish runs, have been struggling mightily.

Even now, many fishermen and fisherwomen are still recovering from the total closure of the ocean salmon fishery along the West Coast in 2008 and 2009, because of poor California salmon returns. The closure devastated the Pacific Coast fishing industry and, ultimately, required millions of dollars in disaster aid from Congress.

In recent years, fishery managers have also had to severely restrict commercial fishing season because of low population levels. My amendment will help prevent future harm to people who are already struggling just to get by.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, first I would point out to my friend from California, if the climate continues to warm, we are not going to be able to store as much water in our mountains as snow, and we are going to need much more surface water storage reservoirs than the laws have allowed us to build because of the delays they have imposed in planning and construction.

The gentleman's amendment gives the Secretary of the Interior the ability to ignore this streamlining law if he determines it could "cause harm to commercial fisheries."

Well, now, remember, this bill makes no changes to any of our existing laws or regulations. It makes no changes to the licenses and permits required for a project or the criteria for obtaining those licenses and permits. It makes no changes to any law or regulation that could affect commercial fisheries or, for that matter, anything else.

It simply says that the agencies and jurisdictions involved with these projects have to cooperate and coordinate and communicate with each other, and it requires the science guiding these decisions to be available to the public to review and scrutinize.

So why the amendment? Well, for one reason and one reason only, I think, because for the last 8 years, we have had an administration that was actively hostile to constructing new reservoirs. That administration has used the fragmented nature of the approval process as a way to delay projects indefinitely. That is what this proposal corrects.

Mr. LOWENTHAL's amendment would allow any administration so inclined to make a specious finding as an excuse to ignore this law. Project applicants would not know from one election to the next whether their millions of dollars of studies and investments would suddenly come to naught, and projects already well along in the planning and approval process could find their efforts coming to a screeching halt.

For our laws to work, they must be predictable and fair. Mr. LOWENTHAL's amendment is a poison pill to render this law unpredictable and capricious.

The irony is this: the gentleman's constituents in southern California have the most to lose from his amendment because southern California depends on surplus water from northern California. And let me make this very clear to the gentleman and his constituents: northern California has first claim on northern California water.

If we can't store the extra water in the north, there is no surplus for the south, and the gentleman's constituents can look forward to dead lawns and gardens, brown parks, empty swim-

ming pools, astronomical water and electricity prices, spiraling grocery prices, and a future where they will have to ration and stretch every drop of water and every watt of electricity in their parched and sweltering homes. They might want to ask him about that some day.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from northern California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of this amendment.

My colleague across the aisle just asked the rhetorical question: Why is this amendment needed?

It is needed because fishing jobs matter. The people whom I represent on the north coast of California and also other fishing communities up and down the Pacific Coast, including Oregon and Washington, their jobs matter, and their limited opportunity to have their interests considered when a dam project is moving forward is what is shortened by the streamlining in this bill.

Their interests are already subordinated oftentimes, but they get subordinated even further by the streamlining in this case, which places the Bureau of Reclamation, the proponent of the new dam, in charge of the administrative record, which places the fish agencies—which often advance the interests of protecting fisheries—in a subordinate role to the Bureau of Reclamation that controls the administrative record, which imposes shortened timelines to make it even harder for their interests to be considered.

Fishing jobs matter. And the truth is, right now, in my district and in many other fishing communities, people are hurting because they have been damaged by poorly operated and poorly permitted dams.

Let's not make things worse. This amendment is absolutely necessary, and I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would first point out that commercial fisheries are controlled and regulated by the Secretary of Commerce, not the Secretary of the Interior, and yet it is the Secretary of the Interior to whom the gentleman would give the power to ignore this streamlining law and impose endless, repetitive, and duplicative delays in the consideration of these projects.

I would again point out that all of the considerations that are given to fisheries, that are given to environmental laws, that are given to engineering laws, everything that goes into the planning process in our dams under

our laws and regulations is fully respected under this measure.

All that it does is say that the agency, that the Bureau of Reclamation, when an application is provided, will pull these agencies together, and all of the jurisdictions and all of the affected parties establish a timetable according to their best judgment of what is necessary, have them talk with each other, and then stick to that plan.

That is what the bill does, and that is why it is so desperately needed in a State that has not built a major reservoir of over a million acre-foot of storage since the New Melones was completed in 1979.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD three letters, including one from the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, which is the largest organization of commercial fishing families on the West Coast, collectively representing thousands of family-wage jobs and the West Coast commercial fishing industry that contributes billions of dollars to the U.S. economy, strongly opposing this bill, H.R. 1654, and supporting the amendment.

PACIFIC COAST FEDERATION
OF FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS,
June 12, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations (PCFFA) is the largest organization of commercial fishing families on the West Coast, representing the interests of hundreds of family-owned commercial fishing operations who harvest and deliver fresh seafood to American consumers and for export. Collectively, we represent many thousands of family wage jobs and a West Coast commercial fishing industry that contributes billions of dollars to the U.S. economy.

On behalf of the hundreds of hard working commercial fishermen we represent, we are OPPOSED to H.R. 1654 for many reasons, among them the following:

While the concept of streamlining permitting for federal water projects is attractive on its face, our primary problem in the arid west is not a lack of water storage projects, but lack of funds for maintaining and repairing the many existing projects that are already in place. Hundreds of existing water projects are badly in need of repair, with many dangerously close to failing. And as we recently witnessed with the catastrophic failure of the Oroville Dam, an "expedited review process" like what is envisioned in H.R. 1654 could lead to poor or rushed impacts analyses potentially resulting in further catastrophe or economic disruption. It is now apparent that the Oroville Dam's 2017 emergency spillway failure was predicted—but the warning signs were ignored—in its expedited environmental impacts review process.

H.R. 1654 is simply the wrong approach. It would undermine existing laws protecting both the public and public resources by making the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) the lead agency for all environmental reviews, in effect leaving Reclamation in control of the entire environmental review process. However, Reclamation has neither the expertise nor the capacity of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service to inform the development of major infrastructure projects to reduce their impact on valuable wildlife and fisheries. Under H.R. 1654, these agencies would be stripped of their authority

and duties to oversee and authorize water storage projects, to the detriment of the people of the West and the American taxpayer.

H.R. 1654 also implements overly restricted and burdensome project review timelines, including provisions that would require expedited review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)—timelines that may be inappropriate for very complex projects like the damming of streams and rivers. These fast-tracking provisions interfere with the ability of agencies and the public to meaningfully analyze proposed complex projects, and could also limit the public's ability to weigh in on infrastructure developments that could affect communities for decades. Further, the bill permits non-federal public entities to contribute funds to expedite project permitting, raising serious conflicts of interest questions about the fairness and impartiality of the federal review process.

H.R. 1654 also establishes perverse incentives for western states to cede their independent authority. Under the new regulatory scheme, state agencies could be compelled to adhere to the bill's procedures, thereby requiring those state agencies to cede control to Reclamation and comply with its timelines. This weakens the essential and independent role that states play in reviewing proposed water infrastructure projects within their borders.

We sincerely request that you vote NO on H.R. 1654. This bill will not solve the problems it purports to address, and it would have widespread consequences far beyond water deliveries and water storage, including adverse effects to regional and local fishing industry economies and the jobs and communities those economies support.

Sincerely,

NOAH OPPENHEIM,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN RIVERS,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2017.

U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: I am writing on behalf of American Rivers and our 200,000 members to oppose H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act, which is before the Committee on April 26, 2017. We understand that new surface storage projects are a consideration as part of a multi-faceted portfolio aimed at addressing long term drought in the Western United States. We also share Congress' view that long-term, balanced solutions to drought and water supply security that support and protect local economies, the viability of agriculture, municipal water supplies, recreation, and the riparian environment are critical to the future of Western communities. H.R. 1654, however, fails to provide a long-term, balanced solution, and goes far beyond the scope of authorities vested in the Bureau of Reclamation (the "Bureau") while undermining the critical role other federal agencies, tribes, and states play in the permitting of water supply projects in the West. We remain concerned about the potential harmful impacts to management authorities designed to protect streams and conserve watersheds. In light of these concerns, we ask you to oppose H.R. 1654.

This legislation amends the Reclamation Act, 43 U.S.C. 371, et seq., in a way that undermines the management authorities of other federal agencies, tribes, and states. H.R. 1654 allows the Bureau to preempt state laws and procedural requirements for agency decision-making by dictating unreasonable deadlines. It also weakens authorities under Endangered Species Act and Clean Water

Act, as well as other federal laws, by subordinating all other State and federal agencies to the Bureau's sense of how much time those administering agencies should have to do their jobs.

Specifically, H.R. 1654:

Designates the Bureau as the lead agency and allows the Bureau to set the schedule for all federal authorizations, including those issued pursuant to the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA), and other federal authorizations, even where those authorizations have been delegated or devolved to the states or Native American tribes.

Forces all other federal, state, and tribal agencies to comply with the Bureau's schedule and to defer to the Bureau's proposed scope of environmental review.

Effectively waives the Endangered Species Act or the Clean Water Act if a state, tribe, or federal agency cannot meet the Bureau's schedule or misses a deadline. The Bureau and the project applicant may simply proceed with the proposed action and the authorization is waived. There are no similar remedies or penalties if the Bureau or the project applicant fails to meet a deadline, or if delay caused by Bureau or the project applicant results in an agency missing a deadline. The end result of this and the following provisions could be that states and tribes may be forced to deny certification for new projects in order to avoid potential legal liability.

It is important that federal natural resource agencies retain the authority and responsibility to condition operations of surface storage projects so as to protect streams and other public resources. A key part of protecting watersheds, especially in the arid West, is maintaining healthy flows in streams. For years, American Rivers has worked with the federal land management agencies, tribes, states and other stakeholders to protect healthy river flows on public lands. Federal land managers, states, tribes and the public have an important role to play in protecting streams—based on the Property Clause of the Constitution, Section 505 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, and other authorities—and they also have a responsibility to work with their stakeholders to do it right. Provisions of H.R. 1654 would harm the ability of federal land managers, states, and tribes to use these authorities to protect streams, rivers, and vital fisheries.

We oppose H.R. 1654, and urge Congress to carefully consider the impacts of the legislation on federal, tribal and state authority before proceeding further and determine if legislation is needed.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW NIEMERSKI,
*Director, Federal Policy,
American Rivers.*

GOLDEN GATE SALMON ASSOCIATION,
Petaluma, CA, June 12, 2017.

Re H.R. 1654 (McClintock)—OPPOSE.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP AND RANKING MEMBER GRIJALVA: The Golden Gate Salmon Association is a coalition of salmon fishermen and women, both sport and commercial, and related businesses. As a business-oriented advocacy organization focused on conservation and restoration of Central Valley salmon stocks, with members throughout California, we write to offer our strong opposition to H.R. 1654 (McClintock), the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act." This legislation threatens tens of thousands of fishing related jobs and could result in severe impacts to a salmon fishing industry that is highly vulnerable today.

SURFACE STORAGE AND CALIFORNIA'S SALMON FISHING INDUSTRY

Surface storage projects have been the leading cause of the decline of California's historic salmon fishery. In the past decade, surface storage projects contributed to the first ever, historic closure of the California salmon fishery in 2008 and 2009. A fishery worth an estimated \$1.4 billion in annual economic activity to California in a normal season was shattered. This had devastating impacts on the 23,000 men and women whose livelihoods depend on the commercial and recreational salmon fishery.

In significant part as a result of dam projects, the health of our coastal fishing communities has decreased. We've seen a decline in the number of commercial salmon boats registered to fish from almost 5,000 in the late 1980's to just over 1,000 today. Once bustling salmon ports, like Fort Bragg and Eureka are lined with crumbling docks and pier pilings. In some places there aren't enough fish crossing the docks to maintain basic infrastructure like boat repair yards, fuel docks and ice making machines. Where once proud freshly painted houses beamed pride of fisherman ownership, too many are sadly in need of repair. Go to any California harbor with commercial fishing activity and inspect the deck hardware and rigging on boats and you'll see what deferred maintenance looks like for people who struggle to keep a roof over their family's heads and pay the bills.

Because of low populations of adult salmon in 2017, salmon fishing for much of Northern California has been closed entirely this year. For the remainder of the California coast, the commercial fishing fleet has lost approximately two thirds of their traditional fishing season. These low population numbers are the result of the drought and the impacts of existing surface storage projects.

Decision-makers should respond to this crisis by strengthening efforts to restore salmon runs. However, H.R. 1654 could increase the impacts of dam projects on salmon, with potentially devastating consequences.

SPECIFIC CONCERNS

This legislation threatens to weaken analysis and permitting for surface storage projects, with significant potential impacts on salmon. GGSA offers the following specific concerns.

Interfering With The Use of the Best Available Science: The bill would allow the Bureau of Reclamation to control the administrative record used by all federal agencies in reviewing surface storage projects. At best, the Bureau lacks the environmental expertise of the regulatory agencies on a range of issues, including salmon. In addition, as a potential applicant for surface storage projects, the Bureau would have a clear conflict of interest, were they to be given control of the record used by all federal agencies. Further, the Bureau has a record of asserting dubious environmental benefits from surface storage projects and working to suppress analysis by federal agencies. As a result, it is highly inappropriate for the Bureau to be given control of a single administrative record to be used by all federal agencies.

Interfering with Agency Review: The bill would give the Bureau authority to establish a binding schedule for all federal agency environmental review and permitting. For the same reasons cited above, this is inappropriate. In addition, this requirement would produce unnecessary, costly and time consuming litigation, in the likely event that a schedule adopted by the Bureau does not allow adequate time for review by regulatory agencies.

Undermining State Review of Projects: In cases where states chose to opt in, the bill would give the Bureau control over the administrative record and schedule for state agencies. In such a case, the bill would allow the Bureau undue control over state analysis and permitting. This is highly inappropriate, given more than a century of traditional federal deference to state law.

Surface Storage Bias: Surface storage construction and operation is among the water management activities with the most severe impacts on salmon and salmon rivers. This legislation inappropriately restricts analysis for the most environmentally destructive method of storing water and generating new water supplies, but not for less destructive activities.

For the above reasons, we urge you to oppose this damaging and unnecessary bill.

Thank you for considering our comments.
Sincerely,

JOHN MCMANUS,
Executive Director.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, by that token, I will include in the RECORD the support of the United States Chamber of Commerce as well as the Family Farm Alliance and others in support of this bill and the jobs that will expand as a result of its adoption.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2017.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce urges you to approve H.R. 1654, the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act," which would streamline the permitting process for new surface water storage projects. The Chamber may consider including votes on, or in relation to, H.R. 1654 in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

H.R. 1654 would establish the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for coordinating environmental reviews and permitting new or expanded non-federal surface storage facilities. The bill also would allow the Secretary of the Interior to accept funds from non-federal public entities and to use those funds to expedite the permitting process for designated projects. This type of coordination and streamlining is essential to the development and construction of much-needed water storage projects.

The structure of H.R. 1654 tracks the permit streamlining provisions contained in Title 41 of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, which was passed during the 114th Congress. The Chamber urges you to approve H.R. 1654.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY,
Senior Vice President & Chief Policy Officer.

FAMILY FARM ALLIANCE,
Klamath Falls, OR, March 8, 2017.

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLINTOCK: On behalf of the Family Farm Alliance (Alliance), we write to express our support for your "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act". This important legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes.

The Alliance is a grassroots organization of family farmers, ranchers, irrigation districts and allied industries in 16 Western states. Several of our members are mutual ditch and irrigation districts. The Alliance is focused on one mission: To ensure the availability of reliable, affordable irrigation water supplies to Western farmers and ranchers.

The "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act" provides a critical first step towards addressing current regulatory and bureaucratic challenges that many times will delay or even halt the development of new water supply enhancement projects in the Western United States. The recent drought has ramped up much-needed Congressional interest to enact legislation that will allow Western water providers to better manage and prepare for future dry times. Now, the heaviest rain in a decade has overwhelmed parts of the West Coast, underscoring the critical importance of having modernized and enhanced water storage infrastructure in place to optimize water resources management for the future.

Family Farm Alliance members rely on the traditional water and power infrastructure built over the last century to deliver irrigation water supplies vital to their farming operations. Our membership has been advocating for new water storage facilities for over twenty years, and we have provided specific recommendations to Congress and the White House on how to streamline restrictive federal regulations to help make these projects happen.

As you are aware, developing new water storage projects is much easier said than done. For many reasons—political, economic and social—the construction of traditional surface water storage projects is undertaken on a much more limited basis than in decades past. Even if federal authorization and funding, or funding from non-federal sources, is secured for a new storage project, the existing procedures for permitting the development of additional water supplies can make project approval incredibly burdensome.

By the time project applicants approach federal agencies for permits to construct multimillion dollar projects they have already invested extensive resources toward analyzing project alternatives to determine which project is best suited to their budgetary constraints. However, current procedure dictates that federal agencies formulate another list of project alternatives which the applicant must assess, comparing potential impacts with the preferred alternative. These alternatives often conflict with state law or are simply not implementable in the first place yet valuable resources are required to be expended to further study these additional alternatives in the federal permitting process.

Thus, we strongly support your bill. We look forward to working with you, the 115th Congress and other interested parties to build a consensus for improving the federal regulatory and permitting process. If we don't find a way to restore water supply reliability for Western irrigated agriculture through a combination of new water supply and management infrastructure, other water supply enhancement efforts and demand management—our country's ability to feed and clothe itself and the world will be jeopardized.

This bill takes an important step towards addressing this critical need. I encourage you or your staff to contact Dan Keppen if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

PATRICK O'TOOLE,
President.
DAN KEPPEEN,
Executive Director.

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA
WATER AGENCIES,
June 19, 2017.

Re Support for H.R. 1654.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA) is pleased to support H.R. 1654, the "Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act". ACWA's 450 public water agency members supply over 90 percent of the water delivered in California for residential, agricultural, and industrial uses.

As demonstrated by California's recent historic drought, it is important that Congress take actions now that help ensure California has sufficient water supplies for the future. Had the streamlining provisions contained in H.R. 1654 been in effect prior to the drought, California's water infrastructure and water supplies could have been improved to help mitigate much of the current personal and economic suffering that occurred.

Moreover, H.R. 1654 is consistent with policy principles ACWA has formally adopted embracing environmental and economic sustainability as co-equal priorities for water management in California.

Thank you for this opportunity to express ACWA's support for H.R. 1654.

Sincerely,

DAVID REYNOLDS,
Director of Federal Relations.

VOITH HYDRO INC.
York, PA, June 20, 2017.

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLINTOCK: On behalf of Voith Hydro, I am writing today to extend our strong support for H.R. 1654, the Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act. Voith Hydro is a manufacturer of hydroelectric equipment and technology based in York, Pennsylvania. Additionally, we have Voith Hydro Services facilities located in Chattanooga, Tennessee and Springfield, Oregon. Voith Hydro currently employs approximately 680 workers across the United States. Water storage issues are critical to our ability to provide both the energy and jobs that sustain a nation.

As you are well aware, water provides multiple benefits to communities across the country. Without an abundant supply of water storage in the United States, hydropower production cannot reach its full potential. These same communities have been able to thrive in large part due to abundant water supplies and the production of renewable hydropower, especially in your home district in Northern California. Increasing water storage throughout the country will allow for better management during drought conditions, and thus prevent power outages to communities reliant on hydroelectricity.

Streamlining the permitting process to expand and develop new water storage throughout the United States is critical to increasing and upgrading our Country's infrastructure. I am pleased to see that Congress continues to consider bills targeted to improve the permitting processes and hope that other infrastructure permitting streamlining continues, especially as it concerns hydropower development.

I encourage the passage of the Water Supply Permitting Act this week in the House of Representatives and look forward to working with you on similar issues in the future.

Thank you for your leadership on water storage and other critical issues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. GALLO,
President and CEO.

MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
OF ORANGE COUNTY,
Fountain Valley, CA, May 30, 2017.

Hon. TOM MCCLINTOCK,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCLINTOCK: The Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC) is pleased to support your measure, H.R. 1654—"The Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act." We applaud your efforts to streamline the permitting process that relates to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands. This coordination is long overdue and will ultimately benefit the entire state.

The rains this past winter emphasized the critical need California has for surface water storage. We cannot let this resource slip out to the ocean due to lack of places to put it. Allowing the Bureau of Reclamation to be the coordinating agency for projects on Interior or Department of Agriculture lands will make the process more efficient and speed up the process for critical water infrastructure projects in our state.

The Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC), a water agency serving the needs of more than two million residents and 28 retail water agencies, voted unanimously to support your legislation and to assist with its passage.

On behalf of the MWDOC Board of Directors, we are pleased to support H.R. 1654 and sincerely thank you for your efforts to address the ongoing water infrastructure needs in California.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact either Jim Barker, our advocate in Washington, or MWDOC General Manager, Rob Hunter.

Sincerely,

WAYNE S. OSBORNE,
Board President.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 232, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

AYES—179

Adams	Carbajal	Davis (CA)
Agullar	Cardenas	Davis, Danny
Barragan	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Bass	Cartwright	DeGette
Beatty	Castor (FL)	Delaney
Bera	Chu, Judy	DeLauro
Beyer	Cicilline	DelBene
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Demings
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	DeSaulnier
Blunt Rochester	Clay	Deutch
Bonamici	Cleaver	Dingell
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clyburn	Doggett
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Doyle, Michael F.
Brown (MD)	Connolly	Ellison
Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Engel
Bustos	Cooper	Eshoo
Butterfield	Courtney	Espallat
Capuano	Crist	Esty (CT)
	Crowley	

Evans	Lipinski	Rosen
Fitzpatrick	Loebback	Roybal-Allard
Foster	Loftgren	Ruiz
Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger
Fudge	Lowe	Rush
Galleo	Lujan Grisham,	Ryan (OH)
Garamendi	M.	Sánchez
Gonzalez (TX)	Luján, Ben Ray	Sarbanes
Gotthelmer	Lynch	Schakowsky
Green, Al	Maloney,	Schiff
Green, Gene	Carolyn B.	Schneider
Grijalva	Maloney, Sean	Schraeder
Hanabusa	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Hastings	McCollum	Scott, David
Heck	McEachin	Serrano
Higgins (NY)	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Himes	McNerney	Shea-Porter
Hoyer	Meng	Sherman
Huffman	Moore	Sinema
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Sires
Jayapal	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter
Jeffries	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Soto
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Speier
Kaptur	Norcross	Suozy
Keating	O'Halleran	Swalwell (CA)
Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Takano
Kennedy	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Khanna	Panetta	Titus
Kihuen	Pascrell	Tonko
Kildee	Payne	Torres
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Tsongas
Kind	Peters	Vargas
Krishnamoorthi	Pingree	Veasey
Kuster (NH)	Pocan	Vela
Langevin	Polis	Vélázquez
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Lawrence	Quigley	Walz
Lawson (FL)	Raskin	Watson Coleman
Lee	Renacci	Welch
Levin	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Lewis (GA)	Richmond	Yarmuth

NOES—232

Abraham	Davis, Rodney	Jones
Aderholt	Denham	Jordan
Allen	Dent	Joyce (OH)
Amash	DeSantis	Katko
Amodei	DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)
Arrington	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)
Babin	Donovan	King (IA)
Bacon	Duffy	King (NY)
Banks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger
Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Knight
Barr	Dunn	Kustoff (TN)
Barton	Emmer	Labrador
Bergman	Estes (KS)	LaHood
Biggs	Farenthold	LaMalfa
Bilirakis	Faso	Lamborn
Bishop (MI)	Ferguson	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Latta
Black	Flores	Lewis (MN)
Blackburn	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Blum	Fox	Loudermilk
Bost	Franks (AZ)	Love
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Brat	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer
Bridenstine	Gallagher	MacArthur
Brooks (AL)	Garrett	Marchant
Brooks (IN)	Gianforte	Marino
Buchanan	Gibbs	Marshall
Buck	Gohmert	Masse
Bucshon	Goodlatte	Mast
Budd	Gowdy	McCarthy
Burgess	Graves (GA)	McCaul
Byrne	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Calvert	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Carter (GA)	Griffith	McKinley
Carter (TX)	Grothman	McMorris
Chabot	Guthrie	Rodgers
Chaffetz	Harper	McSally
Cheney	Harris	Meadows
Coffman	Hartzler	Meehan
Cole	Hensarling	Messer
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Mitchell
Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar
Comer	Higgins (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Comstock	Hill	Mullin
Conaway	Holding	Murphy (PA)
Cook	Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Correa	Hudson	Noem
Costa	Huizenga	Nunes
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Olson
Cramer	Hunter	Palazzo
Crawford	Hurd	Palmer
Cuellar	Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen
Culberson	Jenkins (WV)	Pearce
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (LA)	Perry
Davidson	Johnson (OH)	Peterson

Pittenger	Rutherford	Turner
Poe (TX)	Sanford	Upton
Poliquin	Schweikert	Valadao
Posey	Scott, Austin	Wagner
Ratcliffe	Sensenbrenner	Walberg
Reed	Sessions	Walden
Reichert	Shinkus	Walker
Rice (SC)	Shuster	Walorski
Roby	Simpson	Walters, Mimi
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Wenstrup
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Westerman
Rooney, Francis	Smucker	Williams
Rooney, Thomas J.	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stewart	Wittman
Roskam	Stivers	Womack
Ross	Taylor	Woodall
Rothfus	Tenney	Yoder
Rouzer	Thompson (PA)	Yoho
Royce (CA)	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Russell	Tipton	Young (IA)
	Trott	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—20

Castro (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Scalise
Gabbard	Lieu, Ted	Thompson (MS)
Gosar	Long	Tiberi
Granger	Meeks	Wasserman
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Schultz
Issa	Pelosi	Waters, Maxine

□ 1612

Messrs. YODER, REED, BUDD, CURBELO of Florida, CORREA, PITTENGER, MULLIN, WITTMAN, AND KATKO changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. ESPAILLAT, BLUMENAUER, and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. BYRNE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate Federal and State permitting processes related to the construction of new surface water storage projects on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture and to designate the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency for permit processing, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 392, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, last Thursday evening, we played the annual Congressional Baseball Game for Charity. This is normally the time when the losing manager has to congratulate the winning

manager. Over the last 10 years, I have become fairly proficient at congratulating Mr. DOYLE.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to tell a lot of jokes because, as we all know, at the Republican practice the Wednesday morning before, an individual opened fire on the Republican team and wounded the majority whip, Mr. SCALISE; both Capitol Police officers who were part of Mr. SCALISE's security detail; and two volunteers who were assisting us in our practice. So I don't have a lot of jokes today, Mr. Speaker.

I do want to congratulate Mr. DOYLE and his team. They played fair and square. They were extremely gracious before the game. We had a unity prayer. We had a unity introduction of the players. The night before, Mr. DOYLE and his team invited the Republican team, believe it or not, to the Democratic political headquarters. I went with my two sons. The food was great, and the fellowship was even better.

So I do sincerely want to congratulate him and his players for playing the best game. They deserved to win.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Republican team. We had approximately 25 of our Members at the practice. Every one of them exhibited courage and composure. They all looked out for their fellow teammates.

We had an equivalent number of staff and volunteers. We had two of the best Capitol Hill police officers it is possible to have. They risked their lives.

I want to say this, and then I will yield to my good friend, Mr. DOYLE.

The shooter that attacked the Republican baseball team, Mr. Speaker, was attacking democracy. When we are at full strength on this floor, there are 435 of us. Every one of us is a winner. We get here because we have won an election. We get here because we have got the faith of approximately 600,000 or 700,000 people who are depending on us to be their voice for democracy. We argue. We debate. But as I said in one of my interviews, before our names is United States Representative. United.

Last Thursday, at the baseball game, we were united. I could not be prouder of being a Member of this body, Mr. Speaker. I could not be prouder of the Republican team, including our MVP, RON DESANTIS; our honorary MVP, STEVE SCALISE; and every member of the Republican team.

Would the members of the Republican team stand and let's acknowledge their heroism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is different from the other years that we have stood up here. This trophy isn't for either team. This trophy is for STEVE.

I just want you all to know that when we got the news at our baseball practice about what was going on, the

only thing we could think about is that we are a family. When we stood in the dugout and prayed that you were safe and that no one was hurt, we weren't thinking about Democrats and Republicans. We were thinking about our fellow Members.

I was thinking about your son, Jack, and all the fun times I have had kidding him. I was thinking about CEDRIC RICHMOND's 3-year-old son, who was with us, and what would have happened if that shooter had come over to our dugout.

If there is a silver lining to that terrible day, it was reflected in the outpouring of people who showed up at our game. We normally get a crowd of 9,000 to 10,000. We had 25,000 people come to that game.

We normally raise about \$500,000 for the three charities that the game supports. I have a check here that says we raised \$1.5 million, but that is not correct. It is \$1.7 million. Some worthwhile charities are going to get a check they weren't expecting.

I want to reiterate what you said about our Capitol Police. To have someone shooting bullets at you, that is terrifying enough. To make the decision to put yourself out there and charge at that shooter to make sure that there wasn't a massacre takes a special kind of person.

To see Crystal throw that ball out last night at the women's softball game brought a lot of joy to my heart. We owe a real debt of gratitude to the Capitol Police who protect us on these grounds.

I want JOE to know that we continue to think about all of you. You are in our prayers, you are in our thoughts. Something terrible happened. For many of you, it might take days before it hits you. I would encourage anyone who is feeling that to talk to someone. Don't be bashful about that. This was a traumatic experience for your team, especially, but I want you to know that you are in our hearts and in our prayers.

As we said before, JOE and I are going to walk this trophy over to STEVE's office. When the hospital gives us clearance, we are going to go over to the hospital and present it to STEVE personally. This is for him right now. We want him to know that the entire Congress thinks about him every day, prays for him and his family, and we hope to get him back here on the House floor as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 180, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—233

Abraham	Gaetz	Murphy (PA)
Aderholt	Gallagher	Newhouse
Allen	Garrett	Noem
Amodei	Gianforte	Nunes
Arrington	Gibbs	Olson
Babin	Gohmert	Palazzo
Bacon	Goodlatte	Palmer
Banks (IN)	Gottheimer	Paulsen
Barletta	Gowdy	Pearce
Barr	Graves (GA)	Perry
Barton	Graves (LA)	Peterson
Bergman	Graves (MO)	Pittenger
Biggs	Griffith	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Grothman	Poliquin
Bishop (GA)	Guthrie	Posey
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Reed
Black	Hartzler	Reichert
Blackburn	Hensarling	Renacci
Blum	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Roby
Brady (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Roe (TN)
Brat	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Holding	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Hollingsworth	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Rooney, Francis
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rooney, Thomas J.
Buck	Hultgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Hunter	Roskam
Budd	Hurd	Ross
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Rothfus
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Rouzer
Calvert	Johnson (LA)	Royce (CA)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Russell
Carter (TX)	Jones	Rutherford
Chabot	Jordan	Sanford
Chaffetz	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	King (IA)	Sessions
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Shuster
Comer	Knight	Simpson
Comstock	Kustoff (TN)	Sinema
Conaway	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Cook	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Correa	LaMalfa	Smith (TX)
Costa	Lamborn	Smucker
Costello (PA)	Lance	Stefanik
Cramer	Latta	Stewart
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Stivers
Cuellar	Loudermilk	Taylor
Culberson	Love	Tenney
Curbelo (FL)	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Davidson	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	MacArthur	Tipton
Denham	Maloney, Sean	Trott
Dent	Marchant	Turner
DeSantis	Marino	Upton
DesJarlais	Marshall	Valadao
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Wagner
Donovan	Mast	Walberg
Duffy	McCarthy	Walden
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Walker
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Walorski
Dunn	McHenry	Walters, Mimi
Emmer	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Estes (KS)	McMorris	Webster (FL)
Farenthold	Rodgers	Wenstrup
Faso	McSally	Westerman
Ferguson	Meadows	Williams
Fleischmann	Meehan	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Messer	Wittman
Fortenberry	Mitchell	Womack
Fox	Moolenaar	
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	

Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)

Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—180

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.

Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)

Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal

Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn

Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper

Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney

DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier

Deutch
Dingell
Doyle, Michael F.

Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat

Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Cummings

Larsen (WA)
Lieue, Ted
Long
Meeks

Napolitano
Pelosi
Rogers (AL)

Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez

Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)

Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee

Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.

Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)

Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee

Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)

Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)

Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski

LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal

Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch

Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin

McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore

Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal

Nolan
Nolan
Nolan
Nolan

Scalise
Tiberi
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine

H.R. 1654—Water Supply Permitting Coordination Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, due to a personal conflict, I was unable to make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 318 and "yea" on rollcall No. 319.

SUPPORTING THE UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the dutiful service of the United States Secret Service. The Secret Service protects the President and Vice President, their families, and foreign dignitaries, while also investigating cybercrimes and preventing fraud. These men and women place their lives on the line daily to protect some of the most highly targeted individuals in the world.

Further, they continue to conduct counterfeit interdiction operations despite the increasing need for protective details and low retention numbers.

While the Secret Service is often in the news for personal shortcomings, the organization has had a storied history in protecting the United States. It is a remarkable fact that, within the last year, they have successfully conducted security operations for multiple Presidential candidates, the U.N. General Assembly, a visit to New York City by Pope Francis, and countless foreign dignitary visits to our soil.

So from all of us here in Congress, I would like to thank the Secret Service for their service to our Nation and for their sacrifices. In the coming months, I plan to routinely honor this great example of American exceptionalism.

THE BETTER CARE RECONCILIATION ACT

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the latest plan to gut the Affordable Care Act.

Senate Republicans, as has been reported, just unveiled their draft of their healthcare bill, the Better Care Reconciliation Act, which was developed entirely behind closed doors and will be rushed to a vote, from what I understand, without additional input or public debate.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, this bill will not provide Americans access to better care and it will not create more affordable coverage.

Changes to Medicaid will mean Americans in the expansion population will eventually lose access to crucial services and supports, and shrinking the program will force States to cut services to the poor, the sick, and the elderly.

□ 1632

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 319 (passage of H.R. 1654), I did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on this vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 318 and No. 319 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Lowenthal Amendment. I would have voted "nay" on the Final Passage of

Like the House Republican version to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, the Senate's bill is an attack on the preservation of essential health benefits, and it will not ensure middle-income Americans can receive sufficient financial support to obtain coverage.

The Senate Republican Better Care Reconciliation Act does not deviate from the damage of the core policies found in the Republican House version of the American Health Care Act, and I just hope my Republican colleagues have a chance to realize this before they take a vote on a bill that will only undermine health coverage for the American people.

INTRODUCING THE PUPPIES ASSISTING WOUNDED SERVICE-MEMBERS ACT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, according to recent VA analysis, an average of 20 veterans commit suicide per day. Additionally, 20 percent of those who have served in Iraq or Afghanistan suffer from PTSD or major depression.

Addressing the mental health of our veterans needs to be a top priority, which is why I am cosponsoring the Puppies Assisting Wounded Servicemembers Act, or the PAWS Act. It is an additional way to provide better treatment for our soldiers who are struggling with various forms of mental health following their service and deployment.

This initiative allows the VA to create a 5-year program to give organizations grants to pair veterans suffering with PTSD with service dogs to increase their recovery. Studies show that service dogs contribute considerably to one's emotional and psychological well-being.

Mr. Speaker, the PAWS Act will help with the recovery of our veterans who have paid a great price in serving our country. It is imperative that our veterans' mental health remains a high priority and that they have access to as many options as possible.

JUNE IS NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP MONTH

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize June as National Homeownership Month and to introduce three bills to protect homeowners: the Foreclosure Fairness Act, the National Homeowners Bill of Rights Act, and the Keeping Families Home Act.

In 2016, the homeownership rate in the U.S. fell to 62.9 percent, the lowest rate since 1967. Before the Great Reces-

sion, it peaked at about nearly 70 percent.

Unfortunately, in the past 8 years, New Mexico, my home State, has not seen economic recovery. In fact, as of April 2017, New Mexico's foreclosure rate is 40 percent higher than the national average.

Owning a home is not only the American Dream, it also increases economic activity as well as wealth for the owners. The average homeowner has a net worth that is 36 times that of the average renter—\$195,400 compared to \$5,400.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support my bills, which will make the foreclosure process more transparent and fair, prohibit deficiency judgments, help non-English speakers communicate with mortgage servicers, and keep families in their home.

COMPENSATING VICTIMS WHO CONTRACTED FUNGAL MENINGITIS

(Mr. BISHOP of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a national victim's compensation issue that must be treated with the urgency it deserves.

Nearly one year ago, because of the work of the Members of this body, \$40 million was made available to a victim's compensation program for people who had contracted fungal meningitis as a result of tainted NECC steroid injections distributed in 2012, which resulted in convictions with multiple people. That money was delivered to the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office 9 months ago, yet not a single claim has been paid.

Mr. Speaker, these victims, many of whom are from my district, need justice. We are nearing the 5-year mark of this terrible outbreak, and families across America need this Congress to continue to fight for them.

Against their own will, they became victims of this terrible tragedy, and they certainly do not need to also be victims of more bureaucratic red tape. Enough is enough. It is time to use these funds we secured and start compensating these victims.

I stand ready, willing, and able to help in any way I can, but I urge the officials in Massachusetts to treat this matter like the priority it truly is.

NEW JERSEY MAYORS UNDERSTAND COMBATING CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I stand here proud to represent the New Jersey 12th Congressional District. I stand here proud that Mayor Eric Jackson of Trenton, Mayor Liz Lempert of Princeton, Mayor Francis Womack of North Brunswick,

and Mayor Colleen Mahr of Fanwood led the charge in understanding that our global responsibility to combating climate change starts at home.

By passing resolutions that pledge their commitment to the Paris climate accord, these cities understand that American exceptionalism means we lead from the front, not from the back. I consider myself very fortunate to have lived my entire life in a State that has so many progressive nonprofit organizations and individuals that are working every day to protect public health, our environment, and our quality of life.

I commend these cities in my district and the elected officials, the business leaders, and the private citizens nationwide who have chosen to ensure the cultivation and preservation of this Earth for generations to come.

JUNE IS ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, June is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. Alzheimer's is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, and it has reached crisis proportions.

There is no effective treatment, no means of prevention, and no method for slowing the progression of the disease. Sadly, one in three seniors will die with the disease.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 5 million Americans were living with Alzheimer's disease in the year 2013. This number is expected to almost triple to 14 million by the year 2050.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. Alzheimer's also has a devastating impact on caregivers and loved ones of those diagnosed with the disease. More than 15 million Americans provide unpaid care to family and friends living with Alzheimer's and other dementias.

Compared with caregivers for people without dementia, twice as many caregivers for people with dementia indicate substantial emotional, financial, and physical stress.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now. Let's join the fight. Let's take the pledge to raise awareness about Alzheimer's disease, and to never stop searching for a cure.

□ 1645

PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. PINGREE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, because June is PTSD Awareness Month, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary organization in my district that is making a huge impact on the lives of Maine

veterans managing this challenging condition.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have paid close attention to effective alternative therapies for the symptoms of PTSD, from service dogs to equine therapy, from book and writing groups to yoga and acupuncture. A group in my home State of Maine, called K9s on The Front Line, has created an extraordinary model. At no cost to the veteran, volunteer police dog handlers teach participants to train their own dogs or dogs selected from shelters to be PTSD service dogs.

Many of these veterans have had years of therapy or drug treatment with limited success. Yet, in so many instances, the impact of these service dogs on both veterans and their families has been nothing short of miraculous.

I am proud to honor my constituents at K9s on The Front Line for improving the lives of Maine veterans with PTSD.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION

(Mr. DESJARLAIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the importance of technical education.

Technical education allows Americans of nearly any age to gain practical skills for the modern economy. Students graduate with less debt and also great career prospects because growing industries often partner with local education centers to find the best employees.

My home State of Tennessee, where global auto companies have created a network of high-tech manufacturers, is a prime example. This week, in Franklin County, we are celebrating the groundbreaking of another Tennessee College of Applied Technology campus. The program has been enormously successful across the State, helping Tennesseans who prefer to learn a trade to find meaningful work and helping employers to fill specialized jobs.

I applaud President Trump for his focus on apprenticeship and vocational programs to create jobs and economic growth. This week, I voted to simplify Federal funding for States, which administer a broad range of programs for everything from mechanics to coding. I have also voted to lift Federal restrictions on overdue energy and infrastructure projects requiring thousands of engineers and operators.

The United States must always be an industrial leader. That leadership starts with hardworking Americans pursuing their passions through technical education.

TAX REFORM

(Mr. GOTTHEIMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against dark-

of-night policymaking and extreme partisanship and turn to where we can work together with civility on our most pressing issues.

Instead of focusing on what we do not agree on, we must work together where we can find common ground on cutting taxes for hardworking Americans and businesses of all sizes and investing in the crumbling roads, tunnels, and bridges Americans drive over every day. In New Jersey, our roads are the eighth worst in the country, while our taxes are way too high.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus, I have been working around the clock with both parties since I was sworn in to fix our roads, while lowering taxes and cutting unnecessary regulation and red tape. By doing so, we can increase economic growth in jobs, improve safety, fight terror, ensure clean drinking water, stand by our vets and first responders, and give our country a competitive advantage on the world stage.

We simply can't have a first-rate nation with second-class infrastructure and sky-high taxes. There is political will on both sides of the aisle on these issues, but we can't be spending our energy on rehashing the same tired partisan debates and jamming through partisan bills. We must work together to get things done for the American people.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF STAN McETCHIN

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the passing and celebrate the life of a good friend to many, Mr. Stan McEtchin. Hailing from Vancouver, British Columbia, Stan passed away on June 9, after 92 years of enriching the lives of those around him.

For the past few decades, the small town of Paradise, California, has known Stan as a pillar of the community, whose sculpted metal artwork decorated shops and houses all across Butte County. But before his creative artwork made him a local celebrity, Stan served his country in World War II.

In 1943, he volunteered for the First Special Service Force in the Canadian Army, an elite American and Canadian commando unit that preceded the modern Special Operations Forces we have today. In 2014, the man beloved for his artwork and for his charity was awarded a Congressional Gold Medal right here in Washington, D.C., for his unit's heroism in battle.

I consider myself fortunate to have known him just a little bit, and our country fortunate to have gained such a good man from our northern neighbors.

God bless his family and his memory.

TRUMPCARE, BUT AT WHAT COST?

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, Senate Republicans have negotiated their TrumpCare bill in the dark, and that is just where it should have stayed. And just wait until the CBO score comes out next week.

Knowing that this bill will cause immeasurable harm to millions of American families who will lose their coverage and protections while facing higher costs, I do not understand how anyone could support it.

We constantly hear from our Republican colleagues that TrumpCare keeps their promise to repeal the Affordable Care Act. So you keep that misguided promise, but at what cost?

We are talking about the lives of real people, millions of real people. Aren't they worth more than just a tax cut for the rich?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to scrap this disastrous bill. Let's work together to improve the Affordable Care Act and not destroy it.

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS PROVIDE STUDENTS OPPORTUNITIES FOR TODAY'S ECONOMY

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of today's legislation to advance our country's career and technical education programs. These programs help students learn the skills needed to be competitive and set our young people on the path to success.

I have visited with our manufacturers regularly, and they have repeatedly told me that more skilled workers are needed.

As a former vocational teacher, I have seen firsthand the fulfillment a student can find from getting real-world training in a useful skill, and I am encouraged by the positive steps this bill takes to address this skill shortfall.

There are many paths to success, and the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act helps us pave the way for a high-skilled workforce of Americans to have successful, fulfilling careers.

LGBT PRIDE MONTH

(Ms. JAYAPAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, all over the country, millions of Americans are celebrating Pride Month and our LGBTQIA communities across the country. In fact, this week I will join tens of thousands of Washingtonians at our annual Seattle pride events.

We will come together to support our family, friends, neighbors, and colleagues; we will come together to celebrate the advancement of LGBTQ rights in our country; and we will come together to celebrate the second anniversary of the landmark Supreme Court decision that reaffirmed our commitment to the principle of marriage equality in this country.

But this year, we also come together to acknowledge that we have seen a spike in hate crimes, an increasing coarseness of public discourse, and greater fear-mongering for political gain. We have a lot of work to do.

We intend to protect every advancement that has been made and continue demanding progress toward full protections in employment and housing, safety for our transgender brothers and sisters, and equitable access to healthcare and other services.

There is a lot to celebrate, but much more to do to ensure the promise of equality for all in our Nation. That is what this month has been about, and we celebrate it.

LET'S WORK IN A BIPARTISAN WAY TO IMPROVE OUR HEALTHCARE SYSTEM FOR EVERY AMERICAN

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republicans' ongoing plans to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act. Senate leadership unveiled their plan this morning and plans a vote as soon as next week.

This bill was drafted in secrecy and will have massive consequences for the healthcare of every American. It will affect more than one-sixth of our economy. Yet for all its impact, it was written behind closed doors, with absolutely zero bipartisan input.

I have heard from more constituents on this issue than any other—more than 5,000 letters, emails, and telephone calls: people like the cancer survivor in Lake Bluff who is worried whether she will be unable to find affordable insurance without the ACA's preexisting condition protections; or my constituent in Grayslake, who says he could only start his business because of the individual coverage he bought on the exchange.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the great majority of the American people. It is time to end this ill-considered charade to repeal ObamaCare and work together in a bipartisan way to improve our healthcare system for every American.

SENATE VERSION OF AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT RELEASE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have a copy of the Senate bill to repeal ObamaCare, and it is no wonder they didn't want us to see it.

Like the mean-spirited bill passed by the House, it rips insurance away from millions of Americans, rolls back key protections to patients with pre-existing conditions, and allows insurers to charge older people five times more than others.

Despite the promises that the Senate bill will moderate the coverage cuts in the House-passed bill, the Senate is not only retaining the House bill's fundamental restructuring of the Medicaid program to a per capita cap on Federal funding, but it is deepening the cuts on Medicaid after a few years. This will inevitably lead to the rationing of healthcare for 70 million Americans who are beneficiaries of Medicaid: pregnant women, people in nursing homes, children, and people with disabilities.

It is not even clear what policy goal this bill is trying to solve, except for making insurance more expensive or unavailable for people who really need it the most. It is almost hard to call this a healthcare bill at all.

There were no hearings, no public debate, and after weeks of backroom deals and operating in secrecy, we now have this terrible product that the Senate plans to vote on next week.

I think the American people deserve better.

SENATE HEALTHCARE BILL

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the healthcare bill that has emerged from secret Republican-only negotiations in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, 900,000 people—nearly 1 million—gained health insurance just in Ohio through the Affordable Care Act. But this lopsided Republican bill is even more cruel than their House version. It will rip away care from millions, including very sick people who are suffering from mental illness and opioid addiction.

We all know amazing families, many of whom have come to our offices telling their stories, families who care for the sick and for those who will never be able to realize the dreams due to illness and disability. To put them on the chopping block is un-American and it is anti-life.

The Republican bill slashes Medicaid, which is a lifeline to working people, and puts more crushing costs on millions of seniors dependent on Medicaid for nursing home care.

The Republican bill is anti-life. The Republican proposal makes healthcare unaffordable for many Americans, and basically gives a tax cut to those who make millions and billions of dollars. How cruel is that?

Caring for the most dependent and ill among us cannot be left to chance.

Americans should rise up in protest from coast to coast and oppose this anti-life Republican bill.

LET'S FIGHT TO SAVE THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, healthcare should not be partisan.

I have on my jacket a sign that says "Restore the Vote" to give opportunities to Americans to vote because Republicans have decided that TrumpCare and healthcare is partisan. We need to be able to ensure that everyone has the right to vote.

Today, they issued a mean healthcare bill that is meaner than the House bill. Trillions of dollars are cut from Medicaid, from children and senior citizens. Subsidies are not given to all of those given under the Affordable Care Act. Hospitals will crumble; federally qualified clinics will close; and emergency room doctors, of whom I had the chance to speak to just a few hours ago, indicated 140 million Americans go to emergency rooms, or have gone, for their healthcare. The Affordable Care Act eased that.

But, now with this monstrosity of a bill that undermines and throws Americans off healthcare—23 million and growing—then it really does say that elections do matter and that this is a sinister Republican plan to undermine the American people.

It is time for us to come together, not partisan, but nonpartisan, to fight for our lives and fight for our children and fight to save the Affordable Care Act.

Let's do it now.

□ 1700

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate to represent the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex, where a blend of cultures has shaped our community, from the food that we eat to the traditions that we celebrate. The north Texas area has benefited from immigrants that now call the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex home. In fact, over one-third of the district I serve was born outside of the United States.

It is the rich diversity found in Texas and across the country that have helped make our country great. Immigrants bring their skills and cultures and a belief in the American Dream that benefits each and every one of us. They work alongside us, teach our children, worship in parishes, and contribute to the innovation that has kept America on the cutting edge for decades.

In honor of Immigrant Heritage Month, I remind my colleagues of our

country's legacy as a nation of immigrants. I urge each of you to keep these ideas in mind as the month ends and as we promote policies that directly impact our immigrant communities.

URGING MEMBERS TO REMEMBER THE COMMITMENT THEY MADE TO ONE ANOTHER

(Mr. WOODALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak after my friend from Texas. He is absolutely right. We have an incredibly vibrant fabric of folks across this country. My district looks very much like his district. I appreciate him recognizing those things that unite us and bring us together.

You know, it hasn't been much over a week, Mr. Speaker, since we committed ourselves to changing the discourse here, and just in the last 5 minutes of listening to speakers on this floor, I have heard sinister accusations of what our healthcare bill will do, of mean bills and meaner bills, of cruel bills.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman in this Chamber who doesn't work every day to serve their constituents better than they did yesterday. There is not a man or woman in this Chamber who doesn't want to do better for America tomorrow than we did yesterday. And I promise you that that pathway is not paved with accusations of "sinister," "cruel," and "mean." It is paved with confessions of common ground, common goals, and common opportunity. I urge my colleagues to remember our commitment that we made to one another last week.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF SENATOR JIM BUNNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight to honor the memory of a legendary Kentucky statesman, a baseball Hall of Famer, a man of this House, and a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, Senator Jim Bunning, who recently passed away at the age of 85.

The Members who are joining us tonight, many of them who hail from Senator Bunning's home in the Com-

monwealth of Kentucky, extend our deepest sympathy to his beloved wife, Mary, who was his best friend for many years; his nine children; his 35 grandchildren; and his 21 great-grandchildren.

Those who met Senator Jim Bunning walked away with an impression, and that impression was: That has to be the most competitive person I have ever met.

In a recent op-ed in the Lexington Herald-Leader, providing a great tribute to Senator Jim Bunning, one of his very best friends, sports marketing executive Jim Host, wrote that Jim Bunning was "full of integrity" and, "the straightest arrow I ever met."

In that op-ed, he recounted a story where a reporter of the Louisville Courier-Journal wrote that former U.S. Senator Jim Bunning was "one of a kind," and Jim Host, in remembering his friend, said, "I agree, but more than that, he was an original. No one in politics in Kentucky or, for that matter, nationwide has been or ever will be like him."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman HAL ROGERS, the dean of the Kentucky delegation.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise, like most of the delegation here, in memory of our longtime friend and colleague, the late Jim Bunning, who was an indomitable force on the pitcher's mound, a stalwart champion for the Commonwealth, and the proud patriarch of a remarkable family.

Jim Bunning is the type of guy you always wanted in your starting lineup. With his multilayered talent, Jim valued strategic offense as much as staunch defense not only on the pitcher's mound, but in the Halls of Congress, where he fervently stood for conservative values.

Jim once said: "I have been booed by 60,000 fans at Yankee Stadium standing alone at the pitcher's mound, so I have never really cared if I stood alone here in Congress as long as I stood for my beliefs and my values."

Jim was bold and headstrong, but also fiercely loyal, a combination that made him effective in every endeavor he undertook. He lived a courageous life that was highlighted by his Hall of Fame record and commitment to public service. Jim left an indelible mark on our State, on our Nation, and his legacy will endure for generations.

My wife, Cynthia, and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mary and the entire Bunning family. We are forever grateful for Jim's courage of conviction to faithfully serve the people of the Commonwealth.

I had the pleasure of serving with Jim in the House before he was elected to the U.S. Senate, and many times we would be on this floor when Jim's indomitable spirit would surface. He held strong beliefs and he had strong opinions, but, as Jim Host has said, you have never met a straighter arrow than Jim Bunning.

We are going to miss you, Big Right-Hander.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to JOHN YARMUTH, my friend from Louisville in the Third Congressional District of Kentucky and a good Kentuckian who will demonstrate that Jim Bunning's appeal crossed party lines.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, my neighbor from just down I-64, for organizing this Special Order honoring the life of Senator Bunning this evening.

This is the first time in my 11 years serving in Congress that I have spoken from this side of the aisle, and it is a fitting occasion that I do that. I am proud to join my Republican colleagues and friends this evening.

During his baseball career, Jim Bunning was once asked what his proudest accomplishment was, and he recalled the fact that he went nearly 11 years without ever missing a start. "They wrote my name down, and I went to the post," he said.

I can't help but think that is a fitting way of also describing his political career and his love of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Kentuckians wrote his name down time after time again, and he went to work for them, no questions asked.

Jim and I obviously didn't see eye to eye politically all the time, and as amazed as I was by the curve balls that he threw on the field, I sometimes found myself equally amazed by some of the curve balls he threw off the field, but that was Jim. When so much of what happens in Congress is political theater, you can't deny that he was always real and that every word he spoke, he genuinely believed.

I am sure Jim's family takes great pride in that fact. I join with my colleagues in offering them my thoughts and prayers as they continue to grieve their loss. I hope they find comfort in the lifetime of memories they share together.

It is reported that Daniel Boone once said: "Heaven must be a Kentucky kind of place."

I sure hope that is true.

As I said at the time of his passing, Jim Bunning can now throw no-hitters forever on his field of dreams.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Congressman BRETT GUTHRIE, my friend from the Second Congressional District of Kentucky.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk about my good friend, Senator Bunning, a mentor to me. I first came across Senator Bunning when I was a young boy watching baseball and watching him pitch for the Detroit Tigers and for the Philadelphia Phillies. But I really got to know them—and when I say "them," it is because most of us from Kentucky cannot talk about Jim Bunning without saying Jim and Mary. It is just Jim and Mary. They were grammar school sweethearts. I think the only people they ever dated were each other.

It was wonderful to see Mary the other day, unfortunately under these circumstances, but a wonderful lady.

I have a couple of stories. When I first thought I might run for public office for the State senate—and my now 23-year-old was 5, and I had a 3-year-old son—I went to Oldham County, Kentucky, to meet Jim Bunning. And, of course, you show up, there is Jim and Mary. And she said: “Are you going to be our candidate in the 32nd District?”

And I said: “Well, I just don’t know. I am really concerned about it. I have got a young family.”

And she looked at me and she said: “Young man, I have raised nine kids”—I think at that point 20-something grandkids—“we have done politics, we have done baseball, city council.” She went through a whole list of things. And I will never forget she said: “You are worried about your family because of the experiences that you have had, and you want them to have the same kind of experiences, but you have got to take your family and make your family experiences. Our kids have gotten to do things no other kid has gotten to do because of the positions and the things that we have done as a family.”

You know, when you start to run for office, you kind of want to talk yourself out of it. So I will never forget driving back home convinced that, yes, I am going to run for this office. I walked in, and the first thing my wife said is: “Guess what. We are going to have our third child.”

I guarantee you, if I had not had that conversation with Mary Bunning, and after my wife telling me during the time of that decision we are going to have another one—now our 19-year-old—I wouldn’t have moved forward.

My other story is Senator Bunning took me under his wing. I won my first race by 130 votes out of 27,000 cast. Jim Bunning was running in a fight for his life for the U.S. Senate. Bob Dole comes to Bowling Green, Kentucky, to have a rally for Senator Bunning, and he wanted me to speak. Well, then we see people around town like this that are operatives for our parties, and this one guy says: “No. No State, no local candidates. Only Federal candidates can speak.”

I had to leave the podium because this young, 25-year-old guy said that. And Jim Bunning looks over—and they are all there for his rally—he says: “If he is not speaking, I am not speaking.”

So the next thing I know, I got on the agenda. They said: “Yeah. Three minutes.”

So I had my 3-minute talk.

The final thing I want to say is that one of my favorite Jim Bunning stories is he did not like to sign baseballs made in China. That was just his thing. He didn’t want to sign a baseball made in China, which I didn’t know that, but I had two major league baseballs for my two oldest kids to get them signed. He was going to be in Bowling Green, Kentucky. I show up there. And on the

way, my youngest daughter, which we didn’t think even cared, started crying. Well, to buy a real major league baseball in Bowling Green, Kentucky, at the last minute is not very easy to do. So we went by Walmart, picked up just a little official league ball. And I walked to the restaurant and I hand Jim the first ball. He signs it. The second one, he signs it. The third one—and it is in my office today, because I may have the only one—he picks it up and he points to the “China” imprinted on the ball and just gives me this look like only he could give. And fortunately Mary was there, and she says: “Jim, you are signing that ball for that little girl.” So I now have it in my office in the Rayburn building, a Jim Bunning baseball that says “Made in China” on it. It is something I cherish.

His granddaughter has interned in my office, and she is a chip off the old block, both her grandmother and grandfather. During the spring, we were getting a lot of phone calls in our office because of some of the actions here on the House floor. She was wonderful and mature beyond her years at 20 or 21 years old.

So the old right-hander, as Mr. HAL ROGERS said, is somebody we miss, is somebody that is important to me, somebody that leaves a fantastic legacy in Washington, in Major League Baseball. But far more important, if you had the opportunity to go to the funeral home, just looking at those nine children, and with over 30-something grandchildren and now into the great-grandchildren, that is his legacy. His legacy is his family, and there is no other way he would want it from that first few days in grammar school when he first met his wife, Mary, till today. It is just a legacy that all of us should strive to have.

We love him. We are going to miss him. And we certainly love his wife, Mary, and his family.

□ 1715

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from the First Congressional District of Kentucky, Congressman JAMES COMER.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Senator Jim Bunning. I met Senator Bunning in 1983, when I was 10 years old. He was running for Governor. At the time, he was a State senator in Kentucky, and my grandfather was chairman of the Republican Party of Monroe County.

So when he ran for Governor, my grandfather was the chairman of the county for his election. And I went up to him, a 10-year-old boy, and I had my baseball in my hand—because that is what you did when you saw Jim Bunning, you gave him a baseball to sign—and I said: “Mr. Bunning, I am like you. We have two things in common.” I said: “I am a fan of sports and a fan of politics.”

And he laughed and patted me on the head, and he said: “We are going to get

along just fine.” And he figured out who I was, who my grandfather was, and we stayed close through the years.

When I ran for State representative in 2000, he was one of the first people to call and encourage me and offer his support. I won that election. I served in the Kentucky General Assembly. He was always a supporter. He was always there for me.

I ran for commissioner of agriculture in another statewide office, and he was always there for me. I think the world of Jim Bunning just because I knew him and I knew that he cared and he remembered things.

In 2004, he was running for reelection for the U.S. Senate, and it was a tough election. It was a very close election. In fact, there were 120 counties in the State. With 118 counties in, he was behind in that election. And there were two counties left, Metcalfe County and Monroe County, two counties in my State House district. So he knew he was going to win because he won those counties by 4-to-1 margins.

So every time I would see him, he would remind me that he is in the Senate because of those counties in south central Kentucky. Most politicians probably wouldn’t remember that, but he did.

So I am honored to stand here tonight with Representative BARR and show my support and appreciation for Jim Bunning. Kentucky is a better State because of the leadership of U.S. Senator Jim Bunning.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, when you think about U.S. Senator Jim Bunning and when you think about his remarkable baseball career before politics, Jim Bunning could have gone anywhere and he could have done anything, but it is important to remember that those early days during his baseball career—and I will have to recount a story that was in that tribute that Jim Host wrote about the Hall of Famer Jim Bunning.

And he said that, after his career had ended, it had been about 15 years, and he had not yet been named to the Baseball Hall of Fame by the baseball writers, though when he retired, he was second in strikeouts to the famed Walter Johnson, he had won 100 games in both leagues, he had a perfect game in one of those leagues, and he had a no-hitter in the other league.

He had never pitched for a pennant winner.

A prominent sportswriter told me, quoting Jim Host, that the writers would have never elected him because he never developed relationships with most of them.

But this wrong was corrected the first year that the old-timers committee of the Hall could vote on him. Probably his greatest thrill, other than the birth of his nine children, was the call he got from Ted Williams and others saying they were correcting a tragic wrong by voting Jim Bunning into the Hall of Fame.

When he called Jim Host to tell him the news, his voice was filled with emotion unlike any that he had heard from him before.

And here is what Jim Bunning said to Jim Host:

I am glad those writers—he used another word—did not vote me in, being voted in by the players means more anyway.

In his acceptance speech, he attacked the ills in the game he loved so much that the commissioner and others were not addressing. The officials of Major League Baseball sat on the stage quite uncomfortable. Vin-tage Bunning.

But you know, after that remarkable baseball career and after that wrong was corrected and he was ultimately voted into the Hall of Fame by the players, he chose to come home to Kentucky where he dedicated his life to his family and to public service.

He served on the Fort Thomas City Council and in the Kentucky State Senate before serving in this body, in the House of Representatives, as a Congressman from Kentucky's Fourth Congressional District, and he did so for six terms in a very distinct fashion.

And he capped off his remarkable career in public service by serving two terms and very consequential terms in the United States Senate. Throughout his entire career, he remained a principled conservative, and he was an unrelenting fighter for the causes he believed in and for the people of the commonwealth. Just as he was unafraid to face the boos and the jeers of tens of thousands of opposing fans in Major League Baseball stadiums around the country, Jim Bunning was unafraid to stand alone in Congress for the causes that he felt were right.

And a great example of this—and I like telling this story as the current chairman of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee in this House. Jim Bunning was a fighter for accountability and transparency of the Federal Reserve. And when so many just took the Fed for their word, Jim Bunning stood up and he challenged then-Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan. And many of his colleagues looked at him in dismay because they believed that the Fed just deserved deference, and this great economist should always be taken as being right in what he was doing.

But Jim Bunning, in the end, was right, as Fed policies ended up being one of the causes of the Great Recession of 2008. Senator Bunning's legacy lives on in his amazing wife, Mary, and their many children and grandchildren, including his grandson Eric Bunning, who has been an important part of my team since I first took office.

And I just have to tell one story from the campaign trails. Many of my colleagues have told these stories, but I have got to tell one that is personal to me. Jim Bunning was a legend, and we all revered him. And when I made my first run for Congress, it was kind of coming down the home stretch, and we were the underdog, but I really respected Senator Bunning, and I wanted his political experience and his advice.

And as we were going down the home stretch of the campaign—it was a tight election—Jim Bunning approached me at an event, and he said: "Andy, how are you doing?"

And I said: "We are doing great. We have got the momentum. We are moving forward, and it is really tightening up, and I really feel like we have got the momentum, and we are going to get over the top."

And in his way that only Jim Bunning could be, as honest as he was, he said: "That is not what I hear. I hear you are down by 10 points, and you are going to lose in a landslide."

Well, as it turned out, a few weeks later, it was a close election, and we only lost that campaign by a few hundred votes. But you know what? Just a few days after that concession speech that I had to give, you know who called? It was Senator Jim Bunning.

And even though he was certainly candid in that conversation a few weeks before election day, he said: "Andy, you ran a great campaign. You are a tenacious campaigner. Don't give up. Keep fighting. Be persistent. Do it again. The next time you are going to win."

And you know, that embodies the character of Jim Bunning: tenacious, persistent, determined, principled, a man of integrity.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in praying for the extended Bunning family as we remember a respected former member of this House and a great Kentuckian.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor to join many of my colleagues from Kentucky, and all of the other fellow members of this body, to celebrate the life and the legacy of Senator Jim Bunning.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members participating in this Special Order hour with the Progressive Caucus have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order, which is healthcare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here tonight on behalf of the Progressive Caucus to manage this Special Order hour along with my colleagues, who I will be introducing. Several of them will be joining me tonight to discuss what is going on in the Senate today with the GOP finally unveiling their closely guarded secret plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act, a plan they are unveiling that has had the legislative benefit of no hearings, no witnesses, no expert testimony, no tes-

timony by the public, and, again, no Congressional Budget Office score so far, which is the same way that the legislation passed out of the House side.

So does all of this sound familiar? It should, because this is the same clandestine, in-the-dark process that led to the plan which emerged here in the House of Representatives on the barest of margins with every manner of power play and power ploy engaged by leadership to produce the final result.

That bill, by the way, now stands at a whopping 9 percent in the polls, which means it is even more unpopular than Congress itself. And even though my friends across the aisle rented buses and vans to take them over to the White House to go and celebrate and exult in their dubious victory and uncork the champagne and drink beer with the President and his staff after they pushed the bill through the House, today, President Trump now calls the bill that he celebrated and he campaigned for mean. He says it is a mean bill today.

And there is no question he is right about that. We said that at the time, mean as a rattlesnake, that bill, which would have thrown 24 million people off their health insurance plans and destroyed preexisting health insurance coverage for people with preexisting health conditions.

The Senate version, though, is just as mean. It is downright mean. It may even be meaner than the House version. It not only strips health insurance coverage from tens of millions of our fellow American citizens; it not only forces American families to pay higher premiums and deductibles, increasing out-of-pocket costs, all to pay for a tax cut for the wealthiest of our citizens; it forces Americans, ages 50 to 64, to pay premiums five times higher than everyone else, no matter how healthy you are.

That is right. If you are in the age bracket of 50 to 64, your premiums, under their bill, will be five times higher than everybody else in the population, no matter how healthy you are. It reduces the life of the Medicare trust fund and robs funds that seniors depend on to get the long-term care that they need. It blocked grants, Medicaid to the States, and then, astonishingly, for the first time ever, places a per capita cap on Medicaid payments for all recipients, including disabled Americans and senior citizens.

That is just unconscionable. Think about it. For the first time ever, under Medicaid, the Federal Government would not commit to pay for all of enrollees' health bills. So if your illness or your injuries are too severe or too complicated, your treatment too long, tough luck for you, buddy; you are on your own, Jack. That is the new proposal that is coming out from the Senate today.

The people that railed about death panels before passage of the Affordable Care Act, panels that never materialized and were proven to be an absolute

fiction and fantasy, now seek to throw millions of people off of their health insurance, roll back the Medicaid expansion in the Affordable Care Act, which benefitted millions of our countrymen and -women, and then cut the heart out of the Medicaid guarantee by placing a per capita cap on payments to beneficiaries.

□ 1730

And this particular assault on the health and well-being of the American people doesn't even claim to be a response to any alleged problems with the Affordable Care Act, or with ObamaCare as they call it. It is, instead, a sweeping change to Medicaid that so-called free market conservatives have been trying to make for years.

This Senate legislation, cooked up in secret and seasoned with slashing cuts to Medicaid, is one fine mess. It does nothing but make our healthcare system more expensive, dangerously throws tens of millions of people off of their insurance, and eviscerates the core protections of Medicaid.

And why? What is the public policy being advanced here? All for a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. It takes a special kind of single-minded focus to turn a healthcare bill into a massive tax cut for the people who need it the least in America.

Now, I heard some of my friends, my distinguished colleagues on the other side, say that other colleagues should not have been talking about how the bill was "mean," or "mean spirited," or "mean" because we have a renewed spirit of civility in this Chamber, which we do; and I praise it, and I celebrate it. Ever since the terrible attack on our colleague STEVE SCALISE and other colleagues and the Capitol Police officers who rose valiantly to defend them, we have really tried to put aside a lot of the partisan rancor. But my friends, we have got to talk honestly about legislation which is threatening the well-being of our own citizens.

The word "mean" comes not from my colleagues who were speaking before. The word "mean" comes from the President of the United States himself, who said that the legislation that passed out of the House, looking back on it, was "mean." Now, all of that was in order to say he likes the Senate version instead, but we think that the Senate version is even meaner than the bill that the President has already described as "mean" that came of the House.

So to describe more of the specific terms of this legislation and why it is a threat to our public health, why it is a threat to the basic values of solidarity and justice and community that defines us as Americans, we have invited a number of our colleagues to come up and participate, beginning with the Congresswoman from Seattle, Washington, PRAMILA JAYAPAL, who used to co-chair the Progressive Caucus hour with me.

She has now been replaced by someone because she is moving on to an even bigger assignment right now, but please welcome a great Congresswoman, PRAMILA JAYAPAL, from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, Representative RASKIN.

Mr. Speaker, it is great to have you presiding over the Chamber as well. It is all of our new Members here, and Representative KHANNA from California, who is going to be taking over as co-chair of this Special Order hour for the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, we have to make sure that the American people understand exactly what is going on. This is a bill that the Senate has been negotiating in private. It has been 13 men discussing healthcare for all Americans across this country in a secret room. That is really what has been happening.

Today we saw a draft of this bill, and the prevailing wisdom, when the bill passed the House, was that the Senate would completely revamp the bill. But according to The New York Times, it said: The Senate bill "once promised as a top-to-bottom revamp of the health bill passed by the House . . . instead maintains its structure, with modest adjustments."

It is the same bill. It is the same bill. And in fact, in some ways, it is a little bit worse because the cuts to Medicaid, while they don't take effect as quickly and they are more gradual, they are actually deeper than the House cuts to Medicaid.

There are other things in the bill that have been done, really, in part, to affect how the American people see the bill but don't change the basic provisions of this bill.

Part of the reason they delayed the cuts to Medicaid is so that they hope that they can get a better CBO score, Congressional Budget Office score, which the American people should know the last time around, the second time around after the first time the bill was about to come to the floor and then it got pulled from the floor because there weren't enough votes in the House, the second time when it did pass, it passed without a CBO score. It was not scored.

The reason it was not scored was because there was a belief that that very narrow passage in the House would not happen if Republicans and Democrats found out that the bill, as "revised," was actually just as bad.

So the bill that passed the House still took away health insurance from 23 million Americans. This is where we are today: a bill that has been crafted in secret but is essentially the same bill.

I have received more than 9,000 calls and letters from constituents who have been very clear that Congress needs to

do all it can to protect our seniors, to expand Medicaid, and to defend the gains that have been made over the last 7 years.

And you know what is really ironic about this whole situation is that, if you think about some of the things that Republicans said about the Affordable Care Act when it was being passed—here is a quote.

In 2010, Speaker PAUL RYAN said: "After months of twisting arms, Democratic leaders convinced enough members of their own party to defy the will of the American people and support the Senate health bill which was crafted in secret, behind closed doors."

Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said: "When it comes to solving problems, Americans want us to listen first, and then, if necessary, offer targeted, step-by-step solutions. Above all, they're tired of a process that shuts them out. They're tired of giant bills negotiated in secret, then jammed through on a party-line vote in the middle of the night."

That is what Speaker RYAN said and Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said when the Affordable Care Act was being debated.

But here is the thing: When the Affordable Care Act was being debated, Democrats actually threw open the doors in Congress. They held over 100 Senate hearings. I wasn't here. This is based on actual reports and documents and files from Congress. There were over 100 Senate hearings, 25 consecutive days of consideration, and 161 amendments from Republicans. Many of those amendments were accepted into the bill.

This is a completely different process. We didn't have a single hearing on this bill. The bill came to the House floor, and there was some debate, but it certainly wasn't 100 hearings. It wasn't 25 days of consideration. There weren't 161 amendments. There weren't any amendments that were accepted from Democrats because there was no amendment process.

And now, in the Senate, we are going through the same process where a bill that is about the healthcare of hundreds of millions of Americans across this country is about to come to the floor, and they are not going to accept any amendments, certainly not from the Democratic side. Maybe they will take a few amendments from the Republicans before it comes to the floor. I don't know. We will have to see. But there is no debate on this.

How can we talk about the process of democracy and even of civility and the ability to work together if we didn't offer the other side a chance to weigh in?

This bill will take away health insurance from millions of people, and it will make it less affordable for those who still have insurance because it is not very different from the House bill, and we already know that that is what the House bill does.

It would raise out-of-pocket costs for middle class families with higher

deductibles and cost sharing. It would essentially defund Planned Parenthood by blocking people with Medicaid coverage from accessing preventive care at Planned Parenthood health centers for birth control, cancer screenings, and STD treatment and testing. And it would cut the essential health benefits protections.

Now, what are the essential health benefits protections? We talk about that phrase, but a lot of Americans don't know exactly what that means. So here is what it means.

It means that if you buy insurance, then you can be assured that that insurance is going to cover certain things. It will cover, for example, hospitalization. It will cover if you get cancer. It will cover some of your treatments that you need for cancer, certain things that are included in that. Mental healthcare is part of that essential health benefits coverage.

That is what it means. Otherwise, an insurance company can sell you something, and it can even say we cover, you know, X, Y, and Z, but when you get to the hospital because you are sick, you will find out that it doesn't actually cover hospitalization.

So this was an attempt to say, there is sort of an essential understanding, an essential set of things that would be covered. We will guarantee you that they will be covered if you buy insurance.

Now, I want to talk about Medicaid for a second, because this is one of the biggest travesties of the bill that is being proposed by the Republicans in the Senate.

This bill would literally decimate Medicaid. And between the Medicaid cut of over \$800 billion in the healthcare bill in the Senate and the budget cut that is proposed of over \$600 billion, let me be clear that we are talking about almost a \$1.5 trillion cut to Medicaid through these two mechanisms.

I want to talk about what Medicaid is because a lot of people might think that Medicaid just covers poor folks, which, frankly, I think we should cover poor folks. Let's be clear about that. But I want to tell you what Medicaid actually covers.

It covers half of all the births in the United States. It covers insurance for one in five Americans. It covers treatment for 220,000 recovering people with drug disorders, including those who suffer from opioid abuse. It covers 1.6 million patients, mostly women, who get cancer screenings, and STD testing. It covers 64 percent of all nursing home residents. It covers 30 percent of all adults with disabilities. It covers 39 percent of all kids in this country and 60 percent of kids with disabilities.

So if you cut half of Medicaid, which is what a \$1.5 trillion cut to Medicaid would include—it would be half of what we spend on Medicaid today—a program that covers 74 million Americans across this country, 38 million Americans would lose their coverage.

No wonder, as Mr. RASKIN said, this healthcare bill has had such low approval ratings in the House, and now it is the same bill in the Senate.

Americans understand that whether you live in blue America or red America, whether you live in rural America or urban America, whether you are a man or a woman or a child, whether you are young or old, one of the great things about this country is that we are a country that believes in trying to provide for people when they get sick.

Now, we have been trying to do that for a long time, and until the Obama administration and the Congress passed the Affordable Care Act, we weren't doing that. But in Washington State, my home State, when we passed the Affordable Care Act, Medicaid expansion allowed us to cover an additional 600,000 people across our State. We cut the uninsured rate in half, and we created over 22,000 jobs across the State, including in rural areas.

So what we need to do now is to stop this bill from moving forward because it would be bad for the American people. It is that simple. It is going to kick Grandma out of her nursing home. It is going to stop a kid with asthma from getting an inhaler. It is going to put a premium on being an elder American. If you are an older American, you are going to pay four to five times as much as anybody else. Why? You just have to ask why.

So who benefits from this bill? This bill is a transfer of wealth from middle class Americans to the wealthiest Americans, corporations in this country. So this is about tax cuts for the richest. Sheldon Adelson, who is a Republican donor, casino magnate, he will get, if the Senate bill passes, he will get a \$44 million tax cut in 2017 alone.

How are they paying for that? By cutting Medicaid, taking away protections for preexisting conditions, for seniors, for average Americans.

Mr. Speaker, that is just not right. It is not right if you are a Democrat. It is not right if you are a Republican. It is not right if you are an Independent. It is just not right.

And, yes, the President is correct on this point: It is a mean bill. It is mean; it is cruel; it is unjust. And I hope we defeat it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1745

Mr. RASKIN. I thank the gentleman, Ms. JAYAPAL.

We have next with us Congressman RO KHANNA who is from California. He is an economist, and he is a lawyer. He has taught economics at Stanford, and he has taught law at Santa Clara. He was a Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Commerce Department under President Obama. He is a well-known author who has written a very good book about manufacturing and economic competitiveness in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) who is

going to be taking over for Congresswoman JAYAPAL as my co-convenor of this Special Order hour from here on in.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RASKIN. It is a real honor to be able to co-chair this Special Order hour with the gentleman. The gentleman is one of the most brilliant Members of our body on constitutional issues and constitutional law, really understanding our role in Congress as a check on the executive branch, and I look forward to working with the gentleman. I appreciate Liz Bartolomeo's and my staff's help in organizing this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo what Congresswoman JAYAPAL said about this bill and the impact it is going to have on middle class families and on jobs, because here is one of the things that Congresswoman JAYAPAL said that folks don't understand: this bill is going to affect almost every family that has someone that goes for eldercare, to a nursing home.

The average cost at a nursing home is about \$80,000 a year. Most families can't afford that. Most middle class—most upper middle class families can't afford that.

So what do they do when their savings run out?

Medicare, by the way, doesn't cover nursing home costs. They rely on Medicaid.

What this bill does, in a shocking way, is say: we are going to cut Medicaid funding. Of course, we are going to conveniently cut it starting 7 years from now, coincidentally, after everyone has faced reelection, because we don't want people to know that we are going to cut these programs that they rely on. We are going to start these cuts 7 years from now, and we are going to make sure that people no longer have access to funding to be able to go for eldercare.

Now, here is what is so problematic about this from an economic perspective. One of the biggest job creators, according to McKinsey and according to every economic study, is in healthcare, is for eldercare. Medicaid creates more jobs for working class families and middle class families at a time of globalization and automation than probably any other significant government program.

So not only are we hurting middle class families and the elderly, we are eliminating the very jobs that we ought to be creating at a time of automation. We are eliminating jobs of people who are going to take care of folks who are sick or folks who are elderly, service jobs, jobs that should be paying more.

At the same time, we are coupling this with drastic cuts in a budget for Alzheimer's research and for research on diseases that are affecting middle class families.

Congressman RASKIN said what the bill's motivation is. It is to really save money for tax cuts for the well-off—not for the well-off talking about people

making 70 grand or 80 grand or \$100,000. Those are folks who are going to need Medicaid. We are talking about tax cuts for people who are making over \$1 million, over \$1.5 million.

Now, let's put aside the President that he said it is mean. Let's just see what is their philosophy. Give him the benefit of the doubt. Why do they want to do this? Because they think that giving these tax cuts to these multi-millionaires is going to somehow fuel more entrepreneurship and more growth.

I ask people who are listening to this: Is that the problem in our country? Is that really the issue, that we think millionaires and corporations aren't making enough profits? Is that really what is the issue about why we aren't creating jobs? Or is the issue that, for half this country, their wages have stagnated for the past 30 years, and that people can't afford a decent place to live, college, and healthcare, and they are having trouble getting jobs?

If you believe that the problem is we need more corporate profits, we need more speculation on Wall Street, and we need more economic breaks for the investor class, that that is really what America needs at this moment in our economy, then I suppose you could look for the Republican bill. But if you believe that the real problem in our economy is that the middle class and the working class are getting squeezed by the economic concentration of power, by the excess on Wall Street, that ordinary folks are having a hard time getting jobs, and that what we really need to be doing is providing more jobs in healthcare for people so that they can have a decent middle class life, that what we really need to be doing is providing middle class families with basic economic security so they know that when they retire they will have some dignity for them, or their spouses when they fall sick, that they know that they won't be bankrupt because they have to bear the cost of the care for their parents; if you believe that we ought to be on the side of middle class families—working class families—then it is such a no-brainer that you would oppose this bill.

I will just end with this: People often say, Well, what can we do?

Well, I think you can speak out. I believe you should speak out and hold every Member in this body and in the Senate accountable because this bill is about our fundamental values. It is about what type of country we want to be. Are we going to be a country that gives power to the elite and believes that that is the ticket to American success? Or are we going to bet on middle class families and working class families like we have throughout our history?

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RASKIN, and I am looking forward to co-chairing this with the gentleman.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KHANNA for his very wise and insightful words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RASKIN for yielding to me.

I am very proud and excited to be here because we have so much at stake right now.

I wanted to point to this incredible photo that we blew up from today's news. Fifty people with disabilities were forcibly removed and arrested outside Senator MITCH MCCONNELL's office today. They were there to protest what could happen to them and the 10 million Americans who rely on Medicaid to live a life—often still struggling, but a life with more dignity because they have Medicaid.

I want to take some time to thank them for so passionately but peacefully resisting against the cruel Republican bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act. People were pulled out of their wheelchairs and ejected at the order, I presume, of the leader of the Senate to make space in front of his office. They were exercising their freedom to protest for themselves and for others in their situation. As I said, 10 million Americans with disabilities rely on Medicaid.

The Affordable Care Act incentivizes States to offer home and community-based care under Medicaid. The Republican bill would undo that. It would make it very likely that States would eliminate that home care and community-based care.

Now, I have worked for years with people with disabilities, and I know some of them have struggled to get out of nursing homes and to be able to live in the community which, by the way, is actually less expensive than taxpayers paying for people to be in nursing homes. This has been a tremendous battle for the disability community to be able to live independently.

That ability is threatened. By the way, even the amount of money that would go to nursing homes would be cut dramatically, or could be.

Right now, one-half of the cost of nursing homes and home care and community-based care is paid for by Medicaid, and \$800 billion was cut out of the House bill. I hear that the Senate bill is even worse. So this monstrosity of a bill would do a countless amount of harm to millions and millions of Americans. Just about everyone will be affected.

So, today, I want to focus on the damage it would do to two groups in particular: Americans age 50 to 64 and people with disabilities whom we saw represented by the courageous protesters today outside Senator MITCH MCCONNELL's office.

This bill would impose a crippling age tax on people 50 to 64 years old, which means that they will be either unable to afford insurance altogether or be forced to pay thousands more for it every year.

This is the same age tax that was in the House's version of the bill. The

nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office gave this example: It estimated that a 64-year-old who makes \$26,000 a year could see his or her premiums rise by over 800 percent. That would be in the area of about \$14,000 a year. How does that work? There is simply no way she would be able to keep her insurance.

The Senate bill would allow individual States to undermine the essential health benefits package that is in the Affordable Care Act that ensures older Americans have insurance that actually covers the services they need. Without those essential benefits, insurance companies could end coverage for prescription drugs, for cancer care, for emergency care, and much more.

On top of those attacks on Americans age 50 and older, the bill also guts—as I pointed out—the Medicaid program which is absolutely essential for people with disabilities, both young and old.

Medicaid pays for nearly half of all long-term care in our country, and that includes, as I said, not just care provided by nursing homes, but home and community-based and personal care services that allow people with disabilities to live independently, sometimes to even travel to Washington, D.C.

We fought really hard to provide those home and community-based services. We expanded access to them in the Affordable Care Act. This mean bill not only undoes the progress, it moves us backwards by slashing Medicaid funds and turning it into a capped program, capping the amount of money that may go to every person. The Senate bill is even meaner than the House. Caps would rise more slowly and cause even more damage.

So it is no wonder that the AARP, the Alliance for Retired Americans, the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, the National Council on Independent Living, the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, the American Medical Association, and the American Nurses Association, really all the providers of healthcare, say no to this disastrous bill.

It spells disaster for anyone who depends on Medicaid. That includes pregnant women, infants, children, people with disabilities, and adults—including low-income seniors. The bill is also devastating for women's health. It defunds Planned Parenthood. Let's remember Planned Parenthood is often the only clinic within driving distance of people in rural areas.

□ 1800

Sometimes it is the only clinic available in medically underserved areas for things like cancer screening, primary care, birth control, testing men and women for HIV/AIDS, et cetera. It defunds Planned Parenthood and targets private insurance plans that would cover abortions.

So we really have to ask ourselves: Who benefits from this bill? Who wins if TrumpCare were to pass?

Well, there is an answer. The ultrawealthy individuals who get a massive tax break from this bill—that is why they want to cut all those hundreds of billions of dollars out of Medicaid—they are the winners.

Insurance, prescription drug, and medical device companies also get a huge tax break in this so-called healthcare bill.

Yes, they call it a healthcare bill that benefits only the healthy and the wealthy. I know which side and whose side I am on.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to pause from our analysis of the specific terms of the bill that was unveiled today to ask the question: What is the value that is really at stake in healthcare policy in the United States?

When we were debating on the House side, I heard a colleague get up on the floor and say something to the effect of: Under ObamaCare, under the Affordable Care Act, healthy people are having to pay insurance to take care of sick people.

It took a second for that to register with me. Then I turned to the person I was sitting next to and said: Yes, that is what insurance is. The whole point of insurance is that all of us pay money in, knowing that people get sick in the course of life.

We hope that we are not going to be one of them. We hope we won't get injured. We hope we won't get sick or ill or come down with a terrible disease, God forbid, but we know it can happen, so we all pay in. When it does happen to some people, that is what insurance is for. So the value there is one of solidarity among everybody together.

In the richest country on Earth, at its richest moment in our history, there is another value at stake here, which is the value of justice.

Forgive me, but I want to speak personally for a moment here, because I have what we call a preexisting condition. So this issue of preexisting condition coverage is important to me and my family. I understand it is important for tens of millions of families across the country.

If you are having a great day, and you have got not one, but two jobs you love—I have been a professor of constitutional law at American University for 27 years now, and I was serving in the Maryland Senate. But if you wake up and it is a beautiful day and you have got two jobs you love, a family you love, great kids, and constituents you are committed to, and a doctor tells you that you have got stage III colon cancer, that is what I immediately took to be a misfortune.

It is a terrible misfortune, but we have to remember that it happens to people across the country, all over the world, every single day, where people get a diagnosis of colon cancer, lung cancer, Alzheimer's disease, autism, bipolar disorder, depression, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis, you name it. It is a misfortune because it can happen to anybody.

But if you are told that you have colon cancer, for example, and if you can't get health insurance because, for example, before marriage equality, if you loved the wrong person and you couldn't get health insurance through your spouse, or if you can't get health insurance because you lost your job and you are without health insurance, or if you are too poor to afford it, that is not just a misfortune. That is an injustice.

We can do something about that. Life is hard enough with all of the illness, sickness, accidents, and injuries that people receive without government compounding all of the misfortune with injustice. Life is hard enough without government doing the wrong thing. So the Affordable Care Act added more than 20 million Americans to the rolls of people who have health insurance.

The bill that came out of the Senate today wants to strip health insurance from tens of millions of Americans and jack up everybody's premiums and make healthcare more inaccessible for people. They want to compound the normal difficulties and misfortunes of life with the injustice of distributing healthcare in a radically unequal and unjust way.

We can't go back. It is too late for that. The great Tom Payne once said that it is impossible to make people un-think their thoughts or un-know their knowledge. We have come too far as a country to turn the clock back.

I know there are people on the Senate side, like RAND PAUL, who I saw on TV speaking about this, who think we should get rid of all forms of public attempts to get people health insurance. RAND PAUL takes a perfectly principled position. He says the government shouldn't be involved at all. I don't know how he feels about Medicare or Medicaid. He certainly hates the Affordable Care Act. He just wants to outright repeal it, which is what the GOP said they would do.

So he is going to vote against that bill because it keeps the remnants of the system that we voted in with the Affordable Care Act. I understand that. I understand his position. I disagree with it completely because I think, as Americans, we have got to have solidarity with each other and we have got to take care of each other through insurance because the misfortunes of life can happen to anybody. So we have got to stand together.

He says that is not part of the social contract. Okay. That is fine. I get it. But what I don't understand is people are saying: Well, we said we would just get rid of it, but we will get rid of some parts of it. We will throw millions of people off their health insurance. We will make insurance more expensive for everybody. We will cut the heart out of Medicaid.

Why? What is the public policy that is being advanced here?

It doesn't make any sense. Countries all over the world have arrived at the

point of universal single-payer plans, like in France, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Canada. The countries that can afford it overwhelmingly have said: healthcare for everyone.

That is why I am a proud cosponsor of a bill, which is proudly cosponsored by a majority of the people in the Democratic Caucus. It is Congressman CONYERS' Medicare for All bill.

I think that is where we need to go. I am convinced we are going to get there sooner rather than later. Winston Churchill once said: You can always count on the Americans to do the right thing, once they have tried everything else first.

We have tried some other stuff in between, but we are on the way to taking public responsibility for the healthcare of our people. My healthcare is connected to your healthcare because my health is connected to your health. We want the families whose kids go to school with our kids to be in a relationship with a primary care doctor. We want them to get their shots. We don't want them coming to school sick.

Public health dictates that everybody be in the system. A lot of young men, for example, think that they are too tough to go see doctors. That becomes a danger for everybody else. We need everybody to be in a relationship with a doctor. We owe that not just to ourselves and our families, but we owe it to everybody.

Everybody in the system, everybody covered. That is where America needs to go. But understand that what is coming out of the Senate has nothing to do with that. The Senate plan is all about rolling back the progress that we made under the Affordable Care Act, like the ban on throwing people off of healthcare because they have a pre-existing condition or denying people insurance in the first place because they have a preexisting condition.

The fact that someone has got a pre-existing health condition is the reason that they need health insurance. It is not a reason to deny them health insurance. What they are doing is perfectly backwards.

The Affordable Care Act also said that young people could stay on their family's plan until age 26. Thank God we have had that provision. Even the GOP doesn't want to mess with that, at this point. We got millions of people into relationships with doctors. We could show you dozens of emails and letters and calls that we are getting from people who say: The Affordable Care Act saved my life. I would have had no access to healthcare without it.

The whole idea of turning the clock back and moving in the opposite direction is completely antithetical to the direction of American history. We are moving forward. We want universal coverage for everybody.

By the way, we spend more on healthcare than most of those countries that have single-payer healthcare. I think we may spend more than anybody else on Earth on healthcare, but

we don't get the best results because we leave so many people out and we are spending lots of money on insurance. The last I looked, it was around 30 or 31 cents on the dollar we are spending on the insurance companies, on bureaucracy and red tape, instead of getting people healthcare.

That is the direction we need to be moving in, not dismantling and saving the healthcare protections that we have in place right now.

I want to close with some thoughts just about the process that is going on. Back when the Affordable Care Act was being debated, my dear friends across the aisle complained about how fast things were going and how they thought the legislation was being rushed.

I don't want to embarrass anybody by calling out specific statements made, but we have got voluminous statements made by people on the other side of the aisle saying: This is too fast. You're trying to sneak it through. You're trying to ram it down the throats of the American people. All of this is happening too fast.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the debate over the Affordable Care Act spanned more than 12 months. It took more than a year. The Senate bill was unveiled today with no hearings, no witnesses, no professional testimony, no opportunity for the public to testify for nurses or doctors or patient advocates or any of the groups that are interested; none of them.

In the Affordable Care Act, there were 79 hearings that I was able to find in Congress. That is 79 hearings. Not zero hearings, which is what they are proposing to do now. There were 79 hearings. There were 181 witnesses, both expert witnesses and ordinary citizens, who came to testify before Congress, in public. So far, there has been zero testimony on what the ramifications and consequences are of the bill that was unveiled in the Senate today.

We had multiple Congressional Budget Office scores that analyzed the costs and the impact of different proposals that were part of the ACA. By contrast, the House was forced to vote on the GOP healthcare repeal plan in this body with no CBO score at all, no estimate on how much the bill would cost the taxpayers, no estimate on how many Americans precisely would lose their health insurance. We have learned later the CBO estimate of \$23 million, but that was after we voted on it.

So the people who were saying that the debate moved too fast back then—a year of debate, with dozens of hearings and witnesses, and so on—now seem perfectly content with a process where a bill comes out on Thursday, and then they are going to vote on it next Thursday with no hearings, very little public debate, no opportunity for people to come and testify, and no real opportunity for the public to process what is going on.

What is the urgency?

If it is such a great bill, then we should be out trumpeting it and advertising it. And everybody should have at least one townhall meeting back in their congressional districts to explain how they feel about it so that everybody's constituents can ask us about the bill.

Is it going to improve America's healthcare? Is it going to improve the health and well-being of the people, or reduce the health and well-being of the American people? Is it going to drive our premiums, copays, and deductibles even more?

Those are questions we should have to face with our constituents.

Regardless of what your political party or ideology is, everybody should tell their Member of Congress: At the very least, let's have some public discussion about it. Let's have the opportunity for townhall meetings across the country before we completely rewrite the healthcare plan for the American people.

□ 1815

I urge my colleagues to slow down, take a step back, and work across the aisle for the best possible results. There are things we can do together to help.

For example, I heard the President of the United States come to our body and make a speech in which he said that prescription drug prices were out of control and we needed to give government the authority to negotiate lower drug prices. I agree 100 percent with the President of the United States about that.

There has been no action on that by my friends across the aisle in the House or in the Senate, and I beseech the President of the United States, before you advance 1 centimeter further on this extremely controversial bill, which I understand four Republican Senators have already announced their opposition to today, before you go any further on this, let's get to something we can agree on for once. Let's find the common ground. And the common ground has got to be prescription drug prices are out of control for Americans.

Let us give the government the authority to negotiate for lower drug prices in Medicare the way that we have got it for VA benefits or for Medicaid prescription drugs. We have got that authority, but there was a special interest provision slipped into Medicare part D, and the government doesn't have that authority. That is authority we should have.

Mr. President, we agree with you about that. Why don't you put a pause on trying to demolish the ACA and Medicaid, and let's see if we can get some prescription drug legislation that will bring prices down for all Americans. We are ready to work with you on that.

There are reports that there is some effort to come up with a phony plan on prescription drug prices that wouldn't

actually give the government the authority to negotiate lower prices. I hope that is not true, but let's have a real plan to bring people's prescription drug prices down.

There are things we can do together across the aisle. In fact, the President of the United States said repeatedly during the campaign that his plan would be a magnificent plan that would cover everybody. He said everybody would be part of it. And a lot of people, including me, took him to be invoking the single-payer universal health plans that work all over the world, that work in Canada and that work throughout Europe and so on.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask, would it be possible for us to get together with the President in order to come up with a single-payer plan, the kind that he invoked over the course of the campaign? Let's seize upon the new spirit of civility and community in this body and in Congress to come up with plans that bring us together, that don't drive us apart.

The plan that passed out of the House of Representatives is standing at 9 percent in the public opinion polls. I can't imagine that the Senate plan is going to be any more popular. If this was a mean plan, as the President said, the Senate plan looks meaner, or at least as mean as the House plan is.

But even if you doubled it and said 18 percent of the people would support it, that is still a tiny fraction of the American people. The overwhelming majority of Americans are not sold on this idea of turning the clock back and throwing millions of people off their health insurance plans.

Let us work together, and we can do it. In the societies that have universal health coverage, it is accepted now by people across the political spectrum. If you go to France or the United Kingdom or Canada, the conservatives are not agitating to throw people off of healthcare. The conservatives support a universal payer plan. And there are lots of conservative arguments for it.

For example, let's liberate our businesses, especially our small businesses, from the burden of having to figure out people's healthcare. Let's take that completely off of the business sector, and let's make that a public responsibility the way they have done in so many countries around the world. Wouldn't that be good for business? And doesn't it enhance feelings of community, solidarity, and patriotism for everybody to be covered by the healthcare system of the country that they live in?

We can do this as Americans. We are the wealthiest country that has ever existed. This is the wealthiest moment in our history. Let's come up with a real plan for health coverage that eliminates as much insurance bureaucracy and waste as possible and gets people the healthcare coverage that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity to have this Special

Order hour on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, which has advanced the Medicare for All plan, and I encourage everybody to check it out.

But in any event, we are not retreating 1 inch from defending the Affordable Care Act and the progress that has been made under it, and I hope that we will have maximum transparency and scrutiny of what came out of the Senate today, because we think that the only possible outcome is that bill will go down; then we can come together, find the commonsense solutions, find the common ground, and make progress for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GABBARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1238. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Health Affairs responsible for coordinating the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security related to food, agriculture, and veterinary defense against terrorism, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 23, 2017, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1764. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2017-2018 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-16-0107; SC17-985-1 FR] received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1765. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of the interim rule as final rule — Changes to Reporting and Notification Requirements and Other Clarifying Changes for Imported Fruits, Vegetables, and Specialty Crops [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-16-0083; SC16-944/980/999-1 FR] received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1766. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service; Livestock, Poultry, and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Beef Promotion and Research Rules and Regulations [No.: AMS-LPS-15-0084] received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1767. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Pitahaya Fruit From Ecuador Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0004] (RIN: 0579-AE12) received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1768. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John E. Wissler, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1769. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, titled "Revision of Armed Forces Retirement Home Leasing Authority"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1770. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, titled "Revision of Armed Forces Retirement Home Leasing Authority"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1771. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, titled "Revision of Armed Forces Retirement Home Leasing Authority"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1772. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Credit Union Occupancy, Planning, and Disposal of Acquired and Abandoned Premises; Incidental Powers (RIN: 3133-AE54) received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1773. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry: Alternative Monitoring Method [EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0442; FRL-9964-14-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT57) received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1774. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; VT; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements [EPA-R01-OAR-2014-0604; FRL-9963-88-Region 1] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1775. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Amendment to Standards and Practices for All Appropriate

Inquiries Under CERCLA [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2016-0786; FRL-9958-47-OLEM] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1776. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Mendocino County Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0726; FRL-9960-08-Region 9] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1777. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; CFR Update [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0760; FRL-9963-70-Region 5] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1778. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District and the Town of Mammoth Lakes [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0409; FRL-9955-67-Region 9] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1779. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Western Mojave Desert, Rate of Progress Demonstration [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0028; FRL-9963-86-Region 9] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1780. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's technical amendment — Correction to Incorporations by Reference [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0292; FRL-9963-67-OAR] received June 20, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1781. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report covering the period from February 7, 2017 to April 8, 2017 on the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501) and 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 102-1, Sec. 3 (as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)); (113 Stat. 1501A-422); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1782. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 16-044, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(A); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 141(c)); (110 Stat. 1431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1783. A letter from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of

1978, as amended, including statistical tables on reports and actions as required by the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1784. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a federal nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1785. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Mill Creek, Hampton, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0075] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1786. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Chincoteague Channel, Chincoteague Islands, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0248] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENT. Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2998. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 2995. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of Green Bonds and to establish the United States Green Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2996. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to modify the work requirement applicable to able-bodied adults without dependents; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri,

Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2997. A bill to transfer operation of air traffic services currently provided by the Federal Aviation Administration to a separate not-for-profit corporate entity, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2998. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2999. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to limit copayment, coinsurance, or other cost-sharing requirements applicable to prescription drugs in a specialty drug tier to the dollar amount (or its equivalent) of such requirements applicable to prescription drugs in a non-preferred brand drug tier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 3000. A bill to terminate the designation of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan as a major non-NATO ally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 3001. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a Multimodal Freight Funding Formula Program and a National Freight Infrastructure Competitive Grant Program to improve the efficiency and reliability of freight movement in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3002. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3003. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3004. A bill to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. O'HALLERAN):

H.R. 3005. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a bison management plan for Grand Canyon National Park, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3006. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make loan guarantees and grants to finance certain improvements to school lunch facilities, to train school food service personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 3007. A bill to apply the provisions of title 5, United States Code, related to veterans' preference to the Federal Aviation Administration personnel management system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 3008. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the George W. Bush Childhood Home, located at 1412 West Ohio Avenue, Midland, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3009. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 3010. A bill to provide for the identification and documentation of best practices for cyber hygiene by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3011. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for forgiveness of certain overpayments of retired pay paid to deceased retired members of the Armed Forces following their death; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3012. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to increase the authorization of appropriations for youth workforce investment activities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3013. A bill to provide funding for Violent Crime Reduction Partnerships in the most violent communities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3014. A bill to require servicers to establish a deed-for-lease program under which eligible mortgagors may remain in their homes as renters; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3015. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to provide protections to borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3016. A bill to allow homeowners facing foreclosure to avoid deficiency judgments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3017. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to reauthorize and improve the brownfields program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. HURD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BOST, Mr. BABIN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HILL, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 3018. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that veterans may attend pre-apprenticeship programs using certain educational assistance provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 3019. A bill to require executive agencies to avoid using lowest price technically acceptable source selection criteria in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 3020. A bill to increase transparency, accountability, and community engagement within U.S. Customs and Border Protection, provide independent oversight of border security activities, improve training for U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents and officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 3021. A bill to amend the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007 to stop a scheduled increase in the minimum wage applicable to American Samoa and to provide that any future increases in such minimum wage shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3022. A bill to prohibit the awarding of discretionary grants to institutions of higher education that will use the grant award for indirect costs; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3023. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay reporting fees to educational institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3024. A bill to require certain standards and enforcement provisions to prevent child abuse and neglect in residential programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 3025. A bill to strengthen security and deterrence in Europe and to hold the Russian Federation accountable for violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3026. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for a percentage of student loan forgiveness for public service employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3027. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve recordkeeping and information sharing with States regarding military training performed by members of the Armed Forces and other skills developed through military service that translate to civilian occupations to expedite the transition of veterans to post-military employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3028. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide training for school certifying officials; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3029. A bill to prevent Federal funds from being used to carry out Executive Order 13799; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MESSER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 3030. A bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama):

H.J. Res. 106. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States to provide that Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the number of persons in each State who are citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself, Mr. JOHN-SON of Louisiana, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BACON, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FASO, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MAST, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota):

H. Res. 400. A resolution supporting the designation of a National Day of Civility; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H. Res. 401. A resolution urging China, South Korea, Vietnam, Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, India, and all nations to outlaw the dog and cat meat trade and to enforce existing laws against the trade; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H. Res. 402. A resolution supporting the designation of July 2017 as Uterine Fibroids Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H. Res. 403. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2018 as Endometriosis Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

70. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 2995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 2997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 3001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Authorization

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I—The Congress shall have the Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I—The Congress shall have the Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 3005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (The Property Clause). The Property Clause states that Congress has the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. The Supreme Court in *Fort Leavenworth Railroad v. Lowe* (1885), reasoned that the authority of the federal government over federal lands is "necessarily paramount." The Court opinion went on to further reason that state governments also have rights though with regards to certain activities that take place on federal lands within state borders. The Act provides guidelines for controlling populations of bison in Grand Canyon National Park and requires the Secretary to coordinate with the appropriate State Wildlife Management Agency, thus making it constitutionally permissible.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 3006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1; and Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 3008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3009.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 3010.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes).

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3011.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3012.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3013.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3014.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 the United States Constitution: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3015.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 the United States Constitution: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 the United States Constitution: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 3018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies . . .

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a navy.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution provides Congress the power to "to make Rules for the Government".

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United

States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 3021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 3023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 3025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authorities on which this bill rests are the powers of Congress to: “provide for the common Defence”, “raise and support Armies”, “provide and maintain a Navy” and “make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces” as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 3026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the constitution

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 3030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.J. Res. 106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 2, Clause 3: “The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such Manner as they shall by Law direct.”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SABLON, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VELA, Mr.

QUIGLEY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 95: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 112: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 203: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 299: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 380: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 392: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 400: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 435: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 459: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 490: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 504: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 535: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 548: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 608: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 632: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 676: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 681: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 747: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 792: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 795: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 799: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 820: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 821: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 831: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 849: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TROTT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 881: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1035: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1045: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1057: Mr. THORNBERRY and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 1094: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GALLEGOS, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 1098: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1116: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 1148: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 1149: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1155: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1164: Mr. TROTT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1200: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1205: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1231: Ms. MENG and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1243: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1284: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1315: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1316: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1317: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1361: Mr. FASO.

H.R. 1374: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1384: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1422: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1434: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1454: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1457: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1537: Mr. DUNN and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1552: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 1606: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1626: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1648: Mr. HOLDING, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1651: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 1661: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1664: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1676: Mr. FASO and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1686: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1697: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 1719: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1729: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1772: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 1779: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1783: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 1810: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1815: Mr. PETERS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1928: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 1953: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2040: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2044: Mr. HECK, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2077: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2106: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2121: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2149: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2152: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 2155: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2181: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 2198: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2215: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2248: Mr. POLIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2261: Mr. CRIST, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MAST, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SOTO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2286: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2287: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2315: Mr. OLSON, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2319: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2341: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2418: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 2433: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2478: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 2482: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. TENNEY, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2499: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2522: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 2544: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2550: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 2578: Ms. NORTON and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2643: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2644: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2651: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2663: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 2669: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2678: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2683: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 2690: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2694: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2715: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 2733: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2740: Mr. CRIST, Mr. BACON, and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 2762: Mr. KILMER,

H.R. 2788: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2805: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 2822: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R. 2823: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2829: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2840: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 2845: Ms. SINEMA.
 H.R. 2856: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 2862: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 2871: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 2879: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 2884: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 2887: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 2890: Mr. MESSER.
 H.R. 2895: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 2901: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 2902: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H.R. 2908: Mr. WALZ, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 2909: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. COMER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LONG, and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 2910: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 2917: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 2918: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 2919: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H.R. 2940: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 2942: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 2944: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 2951: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr.

LAMALFA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 2956: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 2958: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
 H.R. 2970: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 2976: Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 2978: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H.R. 2981: Mr. PETERS.
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. TROTT, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
 H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
 H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MAST, and Mr. KILMER.
 H. Res. 185: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H. Res. 351: Mr. KILMER and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H. Res. 359: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H. Res. 390: Mr. WALZ, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
 H. Res. 395: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. KILMER.
 H. Res. 398: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

54. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Akron, OH, relative to

Resolution No. 184-2017, expressing opposition to the proposed federal budget put forth by President Trump; urging President Trump, members of Congress, and other policy makers in Washington to pass a fiscally responsible budget nation; and declaring an emergency; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget.

55. Also, a petition of the Town of Conway, MA, relative to a Resolution calling upon the Massachusetts Legislature and the United States Congress to implement Carbon Fee and Dividend (or "Rebate"), placing a steadily rising fee on carbon-based fuels, and returning all fees collected, minus administrative costs, to households; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

56. Also, a petition of City Council of Akron, OH, relative to Resolution No. 185-2017, expressing opposition to the United States' recent withdraw from the Paris Agreement on Climate Control (the "Paris Agreement"); offering support for the Paris Agreement and its goal of combating climate change on an international level; and declaring an emergency; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

57. Also, a petition of the City Commission of Miami, FL, relative to Resolution R-17-0208, urging President Donald J. Trump and the members of the United States Congress to grant temporary protective status to Haitians in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.